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Abstract

Institutional gangs, also known as the numbers gangs, have become a serious threat to the effective administration of correctional facilities in South Africa. Prior the 1980s, these gangs were active only in correctional centres, but due to modern trends in criminal activity and the gangs’ extensive drug operations, they have become active within communities too. The numbers gangs have a national network that controls activities in all correctional centres across South Africa; this network operates effectively and independently of geographical areas. The numbers gangs contribute a large proportion of all disciplinary offences (e.g., assault, smuggling, escape, sodomy, etc.) that take place in South African correctional centres.

The purpose of this study was to explore the social and cultural dynamics of selected correctional centres, in order to understand the extent to which institutional gangs control and manipulate the correctional environment. The study also focussed on the individual-level characteristics of inmates as a contributing factor for deviant behaviour.

The social processes that manifest in institutional misconduct and violence in correctional centres have been explained in the literature according to three theoretical perspectives; namely, the importation, deprivation and situational contextual perspectives. To develop a better understanding of the phenomenon of gang activities in correctional centres, this study is grounded in the Social Structure and Social Learning theory to explore the individual, social and cultural dynamics of the centre, making reference to these three perspectives.

A mixed research design, comprising both qualitative and quantitative aspects, characterised the methodology used in this study. The data informing the study consisted of primary data (observations, interviews and questionnaires) and secondary data (source documents), with 151 inmates and several centre officials in three Eastern Cape correctional centres participating.

This study was substantial for several reasons. It confirmed the findings of prior studies with respect to personal and social characteristics that inmates import into correctional centres, and, in addition, it expanded the existing literature with respect to how and why inmates import their deviant behaviour into correctional centres. It
further brought a new element to the field of criminology, in identifying the demographic characteristics of inmates that contribute towards institutional gang membership and violence in correctional centres. The study also expanded upon prior findings regarding risk factors associated with institutional gang membership by developing a prediction model to predict possible gang membership prior to and after incarceration. Finally, this is the first known empirical study to examine the social and cultural contexts of gang membership in correctional centres in South Africa.

**Keywords:** Social Structure and Social Learning, prison gangs, importation theory, deprivation theory, situational contextual theory, the numbers gang, social learning theory, South Africa.
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Chapter 1: Introduction and Background

1.1. Introduction

The presence of the South African Police Service is manifested in various communities through their efforts to prevent crime and maintain order and safety within communities. After the transition to the new democratic South Africa, crime was identified as a serious threat to the country. In 1995, the government promulgated a National Crime Prevention Strategy, which shifted the emphasis from crime control to crime prevention (National Crime Prevention Strategy 1995:1). The National Crime Prevention Strategy identified seven crime categories that posed serious threats to the country. Amongst them was organised crime, with prevention strategies focusing on aspects such as the organised smuggling of illegal immigrants, narcotics and gangs that generate high levels of criminality and violence in communities (National Crime Prevention Strategy 1995:4).

In 1998, the government took crime prevention a step further by adopting the Prevention of Organised Crime Act (Act 121 of 1998) which deals with the criminalisation of certain gang activities and declared gang membership to a gang illegal and, by association, any member guilty of a crime. It also legitimises the forfeiture of assets obtained through criminal activity. The effectiveness of this legislation is sometimes questioned, since state agencies frequently face challenges in producing concrete evidence in a court of law to substantiate a perpetrator’s alleged involvement in a gang.

Gangs in South Africa have become a significant challenge for law enforcement agencies, specifically in the Western and Eastern Cape. Gangs are responsible for a number of serious crimes, e.g., violence, drug trafficking and prostitution, which pose serious threats to society. Gangs, however, do not exist only in communities but also within the correctional environment. This study focusses on the gangs that operate within the correctional environment.
The Department of Correctional Service’s constitutional mandate manifest through its safe custody of inmates entrusted into their care in an environment that is safe and secure. After the transition to the new democratic South Africa, the Department of Correctional Services transformed it approach from being a penal system to a rehabilitative system, where new beginnings and the rehabilitation of inmates was the main objective. The successful implementation of the rehabilitation process became a serious challenge due to the prevalence of institutionalised gangs that are responsible for most institutional misconduct and violence (White Paper on Corrections in South Africa 2005:79).

The existence of institutional gangs, also called the ‘numbers gangs,’ in South African correctional centres, can be traced back to the early 1900s. Haysom (1981:1) postulates that the numbers gangs’ historic roots make them distinctive because they are not spontaneous cliques banding together, but have a structure, ranking and disciplinary code that pre-dates the South African Correctional Services. Selepe et al. (1996:3) support this notion and further adds that the numbers gangs also contribute to a large proportion of all disciplinary offences (e.g., assault, smuggling, escape, sodomy, etc.) committed by inmates.

The gang phenomenon in correctional centres does not exist only in South Africa; it is a global threat that poses a serious risk to the security of correctional centres worldwide. The continued increase in misconduct and violence in correctional centres has contributed to a significant volume of scholarly research, attempting to establish the causes and motives that drive such deviant behaviour. From the literature, it appears that causes and motives can be understood from two perspectives; first the historical perspective, which focusses on the cultural, social and structural dynamics of correctional centres, and secondly, the dynamic perspective, which focus on the individual characteristics of each inmate.

To understand the contributing factors that enhance institutional misconduct and gang activities within the South African context, this study conducted a comprehensive contextual investigation into the various perspectives and their influences on inmates’ behaviour.
1.2. Overview of the study

Despite consistent and increasingly intensive efforts to contain or reduce institutional misconduct and gang activities in correctional centres, there is still an increase in assaults, unnatural deaths, and gang activities in correctional centres. The Minister of Correctional Services (Ndebele 2012/2013: 51) mentioned in his annual report that gang violence and riots have become the cause for attention and public scrutiny, and in essence, an impetus for the need to tighten the management of their operations. The statement by the Minister reiterated that gang related incidents remain a concern and are reflective of a range of factors including increased reporting of incidents, the aggressive nature of inmate offences, as well as the spread of violent gang activities in other communities across South Africa.

The Annual Report on Correctional Service (Annual Report 2015/2016:42) in which the Department of Correctional Services reflects on their achievements during each financial year on their different budget programmes, in incarceration the Department failed to achieve targets under security incidents. Security incidents includes assaults, gang related violence, and unnatural deaths.

Table 1.1: Security incidents for the last five years: Annual Performance plan: Correctional Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year under review</th>
<th>Assaults</th>
<th>Gang related incidents</th>
<th>Unnatural Deaths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>10% (641)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>4.67%</td>
<td>10% (557)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>No target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>No target</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.1 above indicated that the Department of Correctional Service had under achieved in all three (3) security indicators that relates to gang activities. For all three indicators over the last five (5) years, it was evident that there was a significant increase in security incidents. The under performance of the Department of Correctional Service clearly indicates that the gang phenomenon is a serious and

In response to the gang phenomenon, the Department of Correctional Service developed an Anti-Gang Strategy (2009) that aimed to reduce gang activities in correctional centres. The Anti-gang strategy outlined five broad objectives that must be implemented at correctional centres to reduce gang activities in correctional centres, namely:

- To maintain a secure and safe environment that is conducive to the rehabilitation of inmates, the attendance of remand detainees in court processes and external movements
- To facilitate the management approach to prevent and reduce the impact of disruptive groups (e.g. gangs), on the Management of Correctional Centres
- To enable inter-sectorial co-operation (i.e. government and civil society) to promote Correctional Centre and Community safety
- To address the potential negative effects of incarceration
- To develop and build knowledge about gangs and effective responses in gang management to inform, review and monitor / improve these strategies (Department of Correctional Service: Anti-gang Strategy 2009:5).

The effectiveness or the effective implementation of the anti-gang strategy of the plan is of some concern, because after eight years of implementation, results presented in the Annual plans of Correctional Service (2012-2016) do not reflect a reduction of the gang phenomenon. The approved Strategic Plan of the Department of Correctional Service (2016-2020) highlight two targets that must be implemented with regard to the anti-gang strategy, namely a gang management checklist, and an inter-departmental national gang management strategy to be implemented (Department of Correctional Service, Strategic Plan, 2016-2020:38). Transpired from the scenario explained above, it is evident that institutional gangs remain a challenge to the Department of Correctional Service. In a recent news article (Spies, 26 April 2016) where three inmates died and 26 inmates’ sustained injuries in a gang fight in St Albans Correctional Centre in the Eastern Cape, it was evident that gang activities are still a prominent feature in correctional centres.
The numbers gangs that currently dominate the social environment in correctional centres consist of six different gangs. In a report by the Human Science Research Council (HSRC gang report 1994:2), it was revealed that gangs have existed in correctional centres since 1911. These gangs are well established and well organised to the extent that some of the employees of the Department even belong to these gangs. A study conducted by (Connolly, 2013) on the world’s most dangerous prison gangs revealed that the South African number gangs were rated most feared gang in the world. Schurink, et.al (1986) postulate that each number gangs are differentiated by its own unique and well-organised system, each with its own code of conduct. These include:

- Symbolism and legends that reflect the behaviour language and conduct of gang members;
- Rank structures- The rank structure of each gang is unique to their purpose and activities. In the 28 gang for example, there is a double rank structure, comprising the ‘redline’ (fighters) and the ‘white line’ (the tronk wyfies or prison wives); in the 27 gang there is no white line.
- Confidentiality- The code of confidentiality is of utmost importance to the numbers gangs because if their secrets are disclosed, the existence of the gang many be compromised. The gangs view secrecy in a very serious light. Should a gang member be found to be divulging gang secrets, war will be declared against the person (Parker-Lewis 2006:27). The secrets of the gangs are transmitted in their:
  - Uniform- Upon entry to the gang, each member is issued with a rank and a unique uniform that is symbolic, meaning that it cannot be seen with the physical eye. Only the individual knows what constitutes his ‘uniform’. The uniform and rank issued to the individual serve as his proof to others that he indeed holds a certain position. When a member is promoted, the uniform and rank change to something that only inmates of the same or higher rank will be apprised of. This ensures that others cannot claim the same status and position in the gang.
  - Tattoos: Every gang has their own tattoos that are unique to their gang (Lötter & Schurink 1984).
Previously, the numbers gangs’ activities were restricted to correctional centres, but due to modern trends in criminal activities and their drug operations, they have expanded into communities and become street gangs. This expansion required that the numbers gangs become more organised, to the extent that they control several organised crime operations and syndicates within communities. According to a newspaper article (Dolley, 6 June 2015) sixteen of the most notorious 28 gang members received sentences that ranged from ten to 25 years’ imprisonment for a variety of community crimes such as robbery, murder, assault, etc.

1.3. Significance of the study

The expansion of the number gangs’ criminal enterprises into organised community crimes, corruption and general violence outside of correctional centres has greatly altered the operational environment, and poses unique challenges for the Department of Correctional Services. Parker-Lewis (2006:27) postulates that the difference between South African institutional gangs and those from other countries is that the South African institutional gangs have created their own imaginary reality, with a distinctive history, coded language, roles, rules, rituals and mythologies, including ‘invisible clothes’ which only the initiated can identify. She further characterises them as having an extensive national gang network; membership of a South African number gangs is for life and remains independent of the individual’s geographical area. To understand why the numbers gangs have become so prominent in correctional centre, it is important to understand the environment in which they operate and how they have used their almost mythical status to convince individuals to join them.

The literature on various aspects of the correctional environment has produced remarkable evidence as to why inmates engage in gang activities and misconduct. Primarily, the literature offers two domains into which causes of institutional deviant behaviour fall; the social and cultural environment of the centre itself, and the individual-level characteristics of the inmate. The social and cultural environment is examined according to the deprivation perspective (Sykes 1958) which postulates that individuals become deviant due to the ‘pains of imprisonment’ (Clemmer 1940).
The situational contextual perspective (Steinke 1991) postulates that inmates become deviant due to the structural dynamics of the centre, such as overcrowding and institutional control. The importation perspective, on the other hand, holds that individuals ‘import’ their deviant behaviour to the correctional centre (Irwin & Cressey 1962); the focus in this perspective is on individual-level characteristics.

In South Africa, this particular field of research is quite underdeveloped and has not been explored to its full extent. Given the unique structural composition of correctional centres and the extensive gang networks that operate in them, such a study is likely to make a significant contribution to understanding the South African institutional gang phenomenon.

The prominent role gangs have in correctional centres places a serious question mark over the effectiveness of the Department’s anti-gang strategy, because after eight years of implementation, the strategy has not managed to reduce institutional gang activities at all. This study provides a scientific analysis into why these gangs are so prominent in correctional centres.

1.4. Aims and Objectives

The aim of this study is to provide a more in-depth understanding of the causes of deviant behaviour in correctional centres. The study intends to explore (Bless & Higson-Smith 1995: 42) and describe (Babbie 2001:93–94), first, the social and cultural dynamics of correctional centres, and second, the individual-level characteristics of inmates, to understand how these factors contribute towards deviant behaviour in South African correctional centres.

To achieve to aim of the study, the researcher developed three objectives, namely:

- To establish the personal and social characteristics of inmates, prior to and post incarceration, that exacerbate institutional misconduct, violence and gang membership;
- To establish the structural and cultural dynamics within the social system of correctional centres that exacerbate gang activities and institutional misconduct and violence; and
• To identify the explanatory variables that predicts institutional misconduct, violence and gang membership in correctional centres.

1.5. Research questions

According to De Vos and Fouche (1998:115–116), research is based on certain questions, which need to be addressed. These questions aim at providing answers to the gaps that have been identified during a literature review and form the basis for the research. The research questions that guided this study are:

1. Do inmates import their individual-level characteristics (personal, family and environmental) into correctional centres?
2. How and why do inmates engage in deviant behaviour in their communities?
3. Why do inmates engage institutional misconduct and gang membership?
4. How does the social and cultural environment of the correctional centre and the community contribute to inmates’ deviant behaviour?
5. What role do correctional officials and correctional administration play in controlling inmates’ deviant behaviour?

1.6. Demarcation of the study

Demarcation, according to Silverman (2000:88), is the reduction of a group or phenomenon that will be studied to a more manageable unit. The topic ‘gangs’ covers a very broad spectrum. In some countries they are referred to as ‘security threat groups’, a term which encompass street gangs, prison gangs, terrorists, cartels and disruptive groups (Knox 2012:3). The focus of this study is only prison gangs, also referred to as institutional gangs.

This study focusses only on sentenced male inmates who were incarcerated in correctional centres during the period of the study. Unsentenced and female inmates did not form part of this study. The study is also limited to newly admitted inmates serving a minimum 12-month sentence and eligible for profiling on their criminal behaviour, as stipulated in Section 38 (2) of the Correctional Services Act (Act 111 of 1998) and to the officials who manage their incarceration.
Specifically, officials responsible for profiling gang members and managing the databases in correctional centres formed part of this study. The applicable officials were those who were responsible for certain key source documents, who were able to provide detailed information on the anti-gang strategy and the behaviour of gang members.

1.7. Ethical Considerations

The University of Fort Hare and the Department of Correctional Services provided written approval (see annexures B and C) for conducting the research. To ensure compliance with the ethical considerations, the research ensured the following:

- All participants were given a verbal explanation on the aim of the study before they were issued with the questionnaire to be completed autonomously. All participants who completed the questionnaire were also asked to sign a consent form (Terreblance, Durrheim & Painter 2008: 73).
- Due to the sensitivity of the data, participants were assured that all information would be treated confidentially. Specifically, no names would appear on questionnaires, data would be kept in a lockable cabinet that was not easily accessible and no data would be disclosed to the correctional administration.

1.8. Proposed structure of thesis

Chapter 1 provides a general introduction and orientation to the study. The chapter provides a detailed description of the research problem and the various theoretical concepts relating to the research topic. The chapter also outlines the purpose and the significance of the study.

Chapter 2 reviews the related literature that is relevant to the aims of the study. A detailed discussion is presented of definitions, concepts and theories relating to the researched social phenomenon.

Chapter 3 describes the theoretical framework on which the study is based. The chapter also indicates how the theoretical model may be used to address the knowledge gaps identified during the literature review.
Chapter 4 provides a comprehensive description of the methodological framework and methods utilised in the study. The research design – a mixed method approach – comprises a combination of both quantitative and qualitative research methods. Exact descriptions of the participants and the data collection tool are included in this chapter.

Chapter 5 provides a detailed presentation of results. The results include coded data from semi-structured questionnaires, unstructured interviews, source documents and interviews. The results are presented according to the three themes identified in the study.

Chapter 6 interprets and discusses the findings. A theme approach is used to outline the research findings and the theoretical conception of the data.

Chapter 7 summarises the themes and provides conclusions and recommendations. The limitations of the study are also presented, along with recommendations for further research.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

2.1. Introduction

This chapter comprises a literature review that seeks to clarify the phenomenon of institutional gangs and violent incidents in the dynamics of the correctional environment across two domains. These are the individual-level domain (characteristics of inmates) and the social-level domain (characteristics of the correctional centre).

The chapter is divided into two sections: First, a literature review on the various theoretical concepts is presented, to explain the causes of deviant behaviour in correctional centres, and second, an in-depth analysis is presented on the social and cultural systems that operate in and control correctional centres.

The literature review intends to highlight the theoretical perspectives argued by various researchers, both domestically and internationally. The chapter will also identify possible knowledge gaps that exist within the phenomenon that this study addresses, to ensure future best practice within the South African context.

2.2. Correctional environment

Neser (1980) postulates that all aspects of institutional life are controlled and managed by the same authorities within the physical environment. The Department of Correctional Services Act (Act 111 of 1998:18) has a mandate to ensure that everyone (i.e., inmates, officials and the public) entrusted into their care is safe and secure. To ensure that they fulfil their mandate, DCS facilities operate under a strict code of conduct that is enforced for inmates and to a lesser degree for officials. Officials are responsible to ensure that inmates comply with the code of conduct through specific rules and regulations (Correctional Service Act, Act 111 of 1998:26). The extent to and manner in which officials execute these rules and regulations determine how the social environment of the centre operates.

The imposition of rules and regulations on inmates has certain implications for inmates’ constitutional rights, e.g., their right to privacy, freedom of movement and to
be treated with dignity and respect. In most cases, inmates find it easy to adjust and adapt to the living conditions in the correctional environment, but many do not. The correctional environment is very complex and to understand this complexity, it is important to know the culture that is associated with correctional centres. The complexity of the physical and social environment arises because on the one hand there is a party that wants to enforce rules and regulations (the administration), and on the other hand, there is a party, larger in numbers, that does not want to be there (the inmates).

The first known empirical study on the correctional environment was done by Donald Clemmer (1940) on the social controls in state penitentiaries in the United States. Other researchers (Sykes 1958; Miller 1958; Messinger 1960; Cloward 1960; Irwin & Cressey 1962; McCleery 1961; Steinke 1991) later supplemented his research. Clemmer (1940) introduced the ‘prisonization process,’ a process that transforms a person into an inmate, and the ‘prison code’ that refers to the normlessness of the correctional environment, where inmates dominate the social controls. Sykes (1958) incorporated the deprivation perspective, stating that inmates are subjected to adverse conditions when incarcerated and are deprived from certain fundamental rights. McCleery (1961) and Irwin and Cressey (1962) understood inmate behaviour from a different perspective, when they postulated that inmates import their deviant behaviour from outside, referring to this as the importation theory. The situational contextual theory introduced by Steinke (1991) later stated that other factors such as temperature, geographic location and staff characteristics could have an impact on individuals’ behaviours.

Empirical studies on the correctional environment in South Africa are very limited. Only explanatory studies, which examine structures and operations of gangs, are available (Coetzee & Gericke, 1997; Dissel 1997; Gear & Ngubeni 2002; Haysom 1981; Lötter & Schurink 1984; Neser 1980; Steinberg 2004). These studies provide knowledge on the characteristics, origin and operations of numbers gangs that operate in South African correctional centres.
2.3. The social and cultural dynamics of the correctional centre

According to Neser (1980:129):

The life style of a community is determined by a culture, which has fixed life patterns, a comprehensive system of traditions and customs, and a system of attitudes, values, norms, and symbols. Culture is a product of an individual's adjustment to their environment, which is determined by two important characteristics, first, it controls behaviour, and secondly, it display variations from group to group. The latter implies that subcultures differ from the mainline culture in respect of attitudes, values, expectations and language usage.

The correctional environment is a unique community that adopts a culture with its own sets of norms, values and behavioural codes. An individual who finds himself confined to this community for any period of time will show a need to express himself within this community. The manner in which such an individual will express himself will be based on his moral development, and how he learned and executed social rules in particular situations.

The theoretical approaches used to understand the context in which individuals behave in correctional centres are based on two broad perspectives, namely the historical perspective and the dynamic perspective. The historical perspective focuses on the culture, structure and social dynamics of the correctional centre. This perspective supports the principles of the deprivation model (Sykes 1958) and situational contextual theory (Steinke, 1991). The dynamic perspective places the focus on inmates’ personality characteristics and in so doing supports the importation theory, according to which responses will differ from inmate to inmate depending on their personal histories and characteristics. From the dynamic perspective and when using the importation theory, researchers argue that personal characteristics contribute to the bulk of inmates’ deviant and delinquent behaviours in a correctional centre. A more comprehensive contextual discussion on the various perspectives and their influences on inmates’ behaviour and their contribution towards gang membership and misconduct are discussed below.

2.3.1. The deprivation Perspective

The deprivation perspective focuses on various administrative processes with which inmates needs to comply during admission to the centre. Clemmer (1940) described
this process as a transformation process, which transforms individuals into fully-fledged criminals. During the transformation process, inmates are subjected to various depriving and humiliating conditions, also called the pains of imprisonment, that have a severe impact on individual personal lives (Sykes 1958:65). The adaptation to these rules and regulations determines the way in which individuals perceive institutional life; they either conform or they resist and become deviant. The deprivation theory offers two different views on the cultural and social dynamics of the correctional centre; first, the absolute deprivation inherent in the inmate’s custody level and the enforcement of a code of conduct; and second, the relative deprivation of the sentence length and overcrowding. Sykes (1958:65) recognised five categories of deprivation within his theory:

Deprivation of liberty: The individual’s liberty is restricted in two ways: ‘first, by confinement to the institution and second, by confinement within the institution.’ (Sykes 1958:65). The former refers to the inability of the inmate to leave the physical confines of the institution, i.e., an individual is sent to a correctional centre for a specific period with a valid warrant and the individual is not allowed to leave that correctional centre. The latter refers to further limitations; the inability of the inmate to move freely throughout the correctional centre itself, with all inmates allocated to a specific cell or house and prevented from moving freely around the institution as a whole.

These restrictions can escalate and inflict great stress and frustration if the inmate serves a longer sentence (Camp et al. 2003:531; Cunningham & Sorensen 2006:254; Jiang & Fisher-Giorlando 2002: 357; Morris et.al. 2009:438) that can result in the inmate being subjected to these deprivations for longer. In addition, if the sentence is longer, it can have an impact on an inmate’s security classification, i.e., he or she may be classified as a maximum security risk inmate (Worrall & Morris 2011:8), which further restricts movement, such as access to programmes and recreational activities. Lastly, if the cells are also overcrowded (Franklin et al. 2006:401; Wooldredge & Steiner 2009:825) it can further increase stressors and frustrations because of limited space and unappealing odours.

In South Africa these limitations can be exacerbated by institutional gangs, since almost all centres consist of communal cells that accommodate 40–50 inmates per
cell (Department of Correctional Service, B- Order). Communal cells and recreational areas are reserved for different gangs (Lötter & Schurink 1984). These cells are divided into certain domains in which specific gangs operate, for example, for sleeping arrangements, the 26 and 27 gangs sleep on the right side of a cell and the 28 gang on the left side. If the centre management cannot control these areas, inmates will be forced to join these gangs in order to be recognised in the cell by other inmates.

The second pain of imprisonment is the ‘deprivation of goods and services’ (Sykes 1958:67). In South Africa, when inmates are admitted to a correctional centre, they are issued on a monthly basis with a standard package of items needed for personal hygiene, i.e., basic clothing, underwear, soap and toothpaste/brush. Additional items such as cigarettes, tobacco and luxury food can be obtained from the inmate shop to which there is restricted access. Inmates’ access is controlled by a privilege system that allows inmates to purchase for a certain amount and quantity, e.g. inmates who enjoy A-group privileges are allowed to purchase for R120, whereas groups B and C have a lower limit on their purchases (Department of Correctional Service B- Order).

In South Africa, substance abuse is a common phenomenon in most correctional centres. Satisfying this addiction is a challenge for most inmates because most cannot afford to maintain their habit in a correctional centre and the unsatisfied craving can result in stress and frustration. Institutional gangs know these situations and take advantage by offering these products to inmates, provided that they join a specific gang. In most cases, inmates do not have other options but to join. An investigation by the Jali Commission (2006:1205) revealed that the inability of the Department of Correctional Service to deal effectively with the high volume of substance abusers in correctional centres has led to a lucrative trade by gang operators.

The Jali Commission states that gangs play a significant role in smuggling items such as drugs, cell phones and dangerous weapons to inmates (Department of Correctional Services, Jali Commission report 2006). Institutional gangs can further restrict access to material goods since they also informally control access to the shop; inmates who work at the shop are in most cases members of the 26 gang and will always ensure that preference is given to gang members. Newly admitted
inmates who do not belong to institutional gangs will also be robbed of their valuable items, e.g., tobacco and cigarettes (Lötter & Schurink 1984). Peacock & Theron (2007:70) postulates that obtaining tobacco, sweets and food in the prison economy was cited as the most important reason why inmates join gangs. In their study they found that 67% of the research participants indicated that they belonged to gangs because of their addiction needs. The early detection and treatment of addictions by the administration is crucial when one considers the many implications as outlined above. The administration needs to ensure that they are in full control of key areas because once the gangs control these places, they manipulate proceedings to their advantage.

Sykes defines the third pain as the ‘deprivation of heterosexual relationships’ (Sykes 1958:70). Inmates in South African correctional centres are not allowed to receive sexual intercourse during their visits. Depriving inmates of heterosexual relationships may cause sexual frustration. Confinement to a male-only society creates other problems as well, such as the questioning of fellow inmates’ masculinity, regardless of their sexual orientation. Any feminine traits in an individual’s personality may be amplified and negatively influence their masculine self-image and their reputation among fellow inmates (Sykes 1958:71). These threats to an inmate’s masculinity can create great stressors.

The fourth pain is the ‘deprivation of autonomy’ (Sykes 1958:73). Upon arrival, individuals lose self-determination. This is not surrendered freely; instead, it is taken by force. Every aspect of an inmate’s life is regulated. The time that they wake up, the food they eat, the clothing they wear, the work they do and the time that they return to sleep are all determined by correctional officials. This routine is determined without any explanation to the inmates and contributes to heightened levels of inmate frustrations (Sykes 1958:75). The loss of self-determination can also reduce an inmate to child status, again negatively influencing inmate self-image.

The final pain is the ‘deprivation of security’ (Sykes 1958:76). The structural design of most South African correctional centres makes provision for communal cells for accommodation purposes, which compels individuals to share a cell with 40 to 50 inmates. This exposes vulnerable individuals to hardened criminals. Inmates who display any form of weakness become targets of manipulative and aggressive
inmates. Conversely, if they demonstrate strength, they may become a target for those seeking to enhance their own reputations (Sykes 1958:78). Thus, inmates will continuously test one another for masculinity and strength.

2.3.2. The situational contextual perspective

The core function of the Department of Correctional Service is to ensure all aspects of institutional life are properly controlled and managed. The manner in which officials manage and control the social environment of a correctional centre determines the quality of the social organisation. A study conducted by Steinke (1991:128) in a California prison examining 500 male inmates found that situational variables such as geographical location, temperatures and staff characteristics positively contributed towards inmate misconduct in a correctional centre. Wener (2006) and later Morris and Worrall (2011:8) supported Steinke’s findings and, in addition, added architectural design, centre organisation and the staff/inmate social system as predictors of institutional misconduct. In another study, Jiang and Fisher-Giorlando (2002:357) found that the situational perspective was more positively associated with non-violent offences whereas the deprivation and importation perspectives included violent offences.

From a South African perspective, studies related to the situational contextual perspective on the correctional environment were non-existent and therefore no conclusion could be made in this regard. However, a study conducted by Schurink (1989:61) stated that the social organisation refers to an association or network of relations among members of the same organisation (including structure and aim of the organisation), and a transaction or a network of relations between individuals involved in a common activity, but not necessarily belonging to the same organisation (Schurink 1989). His study involved in-depth interviews with sixty inmates in the Western Cape Province on the different gangs and their operation in correctional centres. Findings presented using the situational contextual perspective in the correctional environment overlap in many respects with the deprivation perspective. In both perspectives, the cultural and social aspects of the institution positively contribute to institutional misconduct, violence and institutional gangs.
2.3.2.1. **Staff characteristics**

Regarding the staff of a correctional centre, Garland (1990) indicated that correctional officials play a crucial role in how inmates perceived institutional life, because they are the carriers of the institutional subculture. The level of control exercised over the social environment will determine whether inmates will engage in misconduct and gang activities. The perception of institutional life by inmates is based on two values systems, namely harmony and security values. Molleman and van der Broek (2014:35) describe harmony as the level of respect, trust and support between inmates and staff, which will contribute to inmates’ personal development and to their contact with their loved ones. Security values entail the enforcement of the code of conduct, the use of authoritative action and coercion, risk management, control, routine and predictability. If a centre does not have these values systems in place, it is regarded as dysfunctional.

Boin and Rattray (2004) stated that a dysfunctional centre exist when there is a poor relationship between the management and officials. Harmony between officials and management is essential to a correctional environment because once inmates detect that there is conflict amongst staff they will take advantage of the situation to step up their illegal activities and gangs will become a more prominent feature of centre control. These gangs might even incorporate officials that are not in good faith with the administration into their gangs. Dysfunction can also have other severe implications because some inmates might perceive the correctional environment as violent, intimidating and frightening, which can result in inmates seeking to protect themselves from threats by joining gangs (Listwan et al. 2013).

2.3.2.2. **Overcrowding and security level of correctional centres**

Regarding overcrowding and security level of correctional centres, McCorkle, Miethe and Drass (1995) found that overcrowding variables such as population rate, staff ratio and institution capacity were significant predictors for institutional misconduct (McCorkle, Miethe & Drass 1995). Other researchers, such as Camp et al. (2003:527) and Wooldredge and Steiner (2009) had a different view, stating that there was no consistent evidence associating overcrowding with misconduct. They argued that factors such as lack of nutritional services and amenities, which are not
linked to overcrowding, are more likely to trigger misconduct. Camp et al. (2003:527) indicated that there was a positive relationship between staff characteristics and misconduct, and no relationship between the security level and overcrowding of the unit across 121 051 federal inmates in the United States.

In a study by Steiner et. al. (2014:467), they found that measures reflecting the security level (e.g., maximum) of an institution were the only prison characteristics that were repeatedly found to similarly effect misconduct rates.

2.3.2.3. Institutional control

Regarding institutional control or prison organisation of a correctional centre, the security values highlighted by Molleman and van der Broek (2014:35) supra are essential elements of the successful management of a correctional centre. A study conducted by Dilulio (1991:33–59) indicated that correctional centres with effective management structures, line management in terms of communication, effective disciplinary systems and sound cultural dynamics experienced less institutional misconduct than those which are poorly administered. The relationship between the centre management and staff is fundamental to achieving these objectives. Centres that do not display these characteristics are extremely volatile and gangs can easily infiltrate the social system of such a correctional environment.

The manner in which the management of the centre executes daily operations is an important aspect, because if there is no synergy between management and staff in respect of how duties are executed, it can result in conflict between staff and management, which inmates will easily observe and use to their advantage (Camp et al. 2003; Craig 2004). A study conducted by Cunningham and Sorensen (2007) found that centres which are dysfunctional can pose a significant threat to the safety and security of the institution in respect of gang membership, institutional misconduct and violence. Other researchers such as Drury and DeLisi (2010) and Molleman and Leeuw (2012) also supported the effective control of the social environment of the correctional centre. Interestingly, Listwan et al. (2013:1) found that prisoners who perceive the prison environment as violent, intimidating and frightening are more likely to reoffend. In their study they examined the strain associated with imprisonment on 1613 recently released inmates in Ohio.
2.3.2.4. **Institutional control over gangs**

Several studies have been conducted to address the persuasive manner in which gangs operate and take control of correctional centres. In a study conducted by Fong (1990:43) on the organisational structure of two Texas institutional gangs, the Mexikanemi and the Texas Syndicate, he found that the Texas Department of Corrections had developed a ‘building tender system’ to manage correctional centres. The building tender system entails a participative management approach, where the centre administration collaborates with inmates to manage operations in the centre. He found that the building tender system was safe and effective because it allowed enlisted inmates to be part of the control of the centre, and secondly, correctional officials were allowed to select inmates to become part of the building tenders. This granted certain inmates the status of ‘inmate guards’ (Ralph & Marquart 1993:39). The selected inmates were involved in disciplinary hearings of inmates, monitoring and surveillance activities, and even acting as armed guards. The study found that after the implementation of the system there was a considerable reduction in security incidents at the centres (Fong 1990: 43).

In 1991, Fong and Buentello (1991:68) developed a prevention strategy for managing gangs in the two Texas correctional centres where they interviewed 181 officials. They found that requests for protective custody, the number of gang-related tattoos on inmates, increased possession of contraband, and increased physical assaults on inmates and secret racial groupings of inmates were significantly associated with an increase in gang activities (Fong & Buentello 1991:68). Stone and Wycoff (1996:4) supported their notion, finding similar indicators in a juvenile facility in Georgia by interviewing 123 correctional officials. Their indicators included increased requests for protective custody, the number of gang-related tattoos on inmates, increased possession of contraband, increased physical assaults on other inmates, and secret racial groupings of inmates (Stone & Wycoff, 1996). They further argued that the biggest contributing factor to gang activity in juvenile facilities was the presence of contraband. Their study also showed that the commonest institutional responses to gangs are transfers, lockdowns and isolation of gang inmates. These practices follow a similar pattern to those practices found in adult
institutions, although gang-related problems were not reported as occurring as frequently as in adult institutions (Stone & Wycoff 1996).

Knox and Tromanhauser (1993) conducted a similar study, examining 316 correctional facilities across the United States of America and Puerto Rico. They found that gangs significantly affected more than 25% of the correctional facilities and almost half of the facilities provide specialised training to officials in dealing with gangs (Knox & Tromanhauser 1993:16). They found that the most popular method used to deal with gang problems is the ‘set-off’ method. This requires an equal number of rival gang members to be housed in each unit of the facility, ensuring that neither gang gains a numerical advantage (Knox & Tromanhauser 1993:17). Other popular methods of controlling gangs include transferring gang leaders to other institutions, using informers to monitor activities, and interrupting lines of communication between gang members (Knox & Tromanhauser 1993:17).

In South Africa, empirical studies in this regard were non-existent and therefore it is essential to have a South African perspective. The Department of Correctional Services, in response to gang threats, has developed an anti-gang strategy to reduce gang activities in correctional centres. The objectives of the strategy include; identification of gang members, direct supervision, behaviour modification for gang members, an effective disciplinary system and the establishment of security intelligence centres (Department of Correctional Services: Anti-gang strategy 2008). The effectiveness of the anti-gang strategy could not be determined, but in terms of the management of security incidents, the Department of Correctional Services is still under-performing (Department of Correctional Service: Annual Report 2013/2014:42).

2.4. The importation perspective

The deprivation and the situational contextual perspectives discussed previously indicated that the social and cultural environment of the correctional centre could lead to misconduct or violence and gang membership. The importation perspective has a different view from the others; it argues that inmates bring their negative and anti-social attitudes and perceptions into the correctional centre. All three
perspectives mentioned supra have a common objective of determining the contributing factors towards deviant and delinquent behaviour in correctional centres.

Criminologists such as McCleery (1961) and Irvin and Cressey (1962) introduced the importation perspective, arguing that behavioural patterns individuals learned in the street/community determine the likelihood of their engaging in violence and misconduct in correctional centres. The importation perspective focuses on inmates’ personal behavioural characteristics acquired from the street and brought into the centre, or ‘imported’ to the correctional environment. Irvin and Cressey (1962:137) classified these behavioural characteristics according to three different subcultures, namely, the thief, the convict and the legitimate subcultures.

Inmates associated with the thief subculture are characterised as the ‘right guys’ in the centre, who follow the beliefs that inmates believe they should display, which include ‘inmates should not betray each other to the police (corrections officials), should be reliable, wily but trustworthy, cool headed’ (Irwin & Cressey 1962:137). To be acknowledged in the thief subculture, inmates are expected to display similar attitudes. Inmates with thief subculture attitudes usually adapt easily to the correctional environment because they might not be first-time offenders, or they have always displayed these attitudes in society. Studies conducted by several other authors (Cunningham & Sorensen 2007; Griffin & Hepburn 2006; Jiang & Winfree, 2006; Lahm 2008) support this notion, indicating that inmates with prior incarceration are more likely to commit institutional misconduct. These type of inmates tend to adopt the ‘jailing adaptation’ style (Irwin 1970:75) because they see the correctional environment as their natural environment, where they have mastered techniques for manipulating the system. These inmates are known as experts in the field of smuggling, trading in contraband and gambling.

Inmates in the convict subculture have a utilitarian approach; they use people around them to achieve their own ends, take pleasure in their deviant and delinquent acts and do not consider the consequences of their actions. They are the manipulative inmates and can easily rise to the upper echelons of the hierarchy in gangs. Irwin and Cressey (1962) believe that this culture is not unique to any specific institution or type of institution. Instead, this utilitarianism is believed to be part of the

Inmates in the convict subculture are usually the most susceptible to institutional misconduct or violence because they are constantly looking for recognition and status in the centre. These inmates are usually younger; they are relatively new to the environment and do not have any gang affiliations or are still in the lower ranks of the gangs and want promotion. Several other authors (Flanagan 1983; Malibi, Holley, Patrick & Walls 1979), who state that younger inmates perpetrate violent acts more frequently than older inmates, support the notion. Adams (1992:302) states that younger inmates easily resort to conflict ‘in ways that are demonstrable, visible and that advertise toughness and strength.’

Convict inmates have usually been known for their criminal activities since childhood and, due to their anti-social behaviour, have been involved in criminal activities as members of street gangs, displaying violent behaviour and abusing substances. They are also more likely to have spent time in reformatory school, which eventually leads to incarceration in a correctional centre. Since reform school graduates are already accustomed to the norms of inmate culture, they feel prepared to take a leadership role immediately upon entering the correctional centre. These inmates are most likely to become members of institutional gangs and to become highly ranked in the hierarchy of the gang.

The legitimate subculture inmates are those who are not associated with criminal element in the correctional centre. These inmates prefer to accept the rules and regulations of the institution and will at all times try to make their life in the institution easier through legitimate means. They reject the means of the thief and the convict subcultures and traditionally pose very few problems for correctional officials, making up a substantial portion of the inmate population (Irwin & Cressey 1962:139). They are usually the non-gang members that prefer to finish their sentence in the shortest time possible by engaging in rehabilitation programmes such as educational and counselling programmes, in order to be released from the centre. They are seen as the inmates who want to change their lives for the better by examining their past behaviours and attempting to define the causes of their criminality in an effort to
prevent further deviant behaviour (Irwin 1970:79). This type of inmate will avoid infringements and institutional rule violations at all costs.

These inmates are usually first-time offenders and the most vulnerable, because they still have desire to be with loved ones and close relatives. Wright (1991:12) found that inmate support networks, such as employment history, education and marital status, play a fundamental role in determining an inmate’s behaviour in a correctional centre. He found that inmates who had a good employment history, who were well educated and who had strong family ties, tended to refrain from unlawful institutional activities.

The founding literature on the importation perspective developed by McCleery (1961), Irwin and Cressey (1962) and Irwin (1970) inspired several other studies on this phenomenon, which developed several new variables associated with the importation perspective. These variables include age, race, criminal history and the support networks of the individual. Most studies proceeding from this perspective have found a positive relationship between the imported characteristics and inmate misconduct and gang activities in correctional centres.

2.4.1. Age of inmates

The age of inmates is one of the most consistent variables in institutional misconduct and gangs. MacKenzie (1987) states that younger inmates are more likely to display aggressive behaviour than older inmates, a view which (Blackburn & Trulson 2010; Camp, Gaes, Langan & Saylor 2003; Cunningham & Sorensen 2007; DeLisi et al. 2010; Griffin & Hepburn 2006; Kuanliang, Sorensen, & Cunningham 2008; Steiner, Butler, & Ellison 2014; Trulson, 2007; Trulson, DeLisi, Caudill, Belshaw, & Marquart 2010; Walters & Crawford 2013) supports. McCleery (1961:166) refers to these type of inmates as ‘reform school graduates’. Since the reform school graduates are already accustomed to the norms of inmate culture, they feel prepared to take a leadership role immediately upon entering the institution. These inmates are most likely part of institutional gangs and are highly ranked in the hierarchy of the gang to which they belong.

A study conducted by Hunt, Riegel, Morales and Waldorf (1993:339) examined the impact that young inmates had on the correctional population. They used the
snowball technique to interview 39 former and current inmates in California correctional facilities. They found that young inmates were the most frequent perpetrators of violence and were more likely to form protective groups that end up being gangs (Hunt et al. 1993:399).

Another study by Huff (1996) examined juvenile gang members classified by various organisations in four different communities in the United States. He examined the likelihood of the 187 juveniles engaging in delinquent activities. He found that gang members were more likely to be involved in serious crimes compared to non-gang members. He also found that gang members were more likely to engage in drug activities, robberies and assaults (Huff 1996:84).

In the most recent study by Kuanliang et al. (2008) postulates that inmates tend to refrain from misconduct as they grow older. As inmates become adults, they tend to be less active in institutional misconduct than when they were young. Valentine et. al. (2015) also supported the notion of Kuanliang et al. (2008).

### 2.4.2. Previous convictions of inmates

An inmate’s criminal history was also positively identified as an indicator for violent behaviour. In a study conducted by Sheldon (1991), juveniles’ criminal records were examined – those of both gang members and non-gang members. He found that gang members had 22% more previous criminal offences than non-gang members and that most gang members had started their criminal activities at a younger age than the non-gang members (Sheldon 1991:53).

Ralph, Hunter, Marquart, Cuvelier supported Sheldon’s notion and Merianos (1996:132), who posit that gang member have significantly more previous convictions that non-gang members. In their study, they found that gang members had an average of 1.71 previous convictions compare to 1.55 previous convictions for non-gang members. They also discovered a 29% difference between gang members and non-gang members for first offences (Ralph et al. 1996). A recent study by Delisi et al (2014:130) indicated that gang members accumulated more convictions for robbery than non-gang members (Delisi, Spruill, Vaughn and Trulson 2014).
The type of offence committed by inmates was also identified as a variable for misconduct and gang membership. According to Stone and Wycoff (1996), gang members are more likely to have a history of violent crimes compared to non-gang members (Stone & Wycoff 1996:5). These findings are consistent with most studies; e.g., Ralph et al. (1996) found that 12% of gang members had been convicted for murder, whereas non-gang members had an only 4% conviction rate for murder. Similar findings were also revealed for robbery and assault charges.

In a study conducted by Adams (1992:305), it was found that ‘violent offenders tend to have higher centre infraction rates than non-violent offenders’. Inmates who committed violent offences and who had multiple criminal offences tended to be more aggressive. Other researchers (Cunningham & Sorensen 2007; Griffin & Hepburn 2006; Jiang & Winfree 2006; Lahm 2008) support Adams’ findings.

### 2.4.3. Socio Economic Status (SES) of inmates

An inmate's socio-economic status is also associated with institutional misconduct and gang membership. Wright (1991:12) found that support networks, e.g., employment history, education and marital status, play a fundamental role in determining inmates’ behaviour. His study was conducted across ten correctional centres in the United States, where he examined the differences and similarities between violent and victimised inmates (Wright 1991). Persistent factors supporting gang membership according Hagedorn (2007) were social exclusion of the poor, increasing inequalities of income and wealth, and residualization of welfare (Hagedorn 2007). Other researcher (Hills et al. 2009; Wacquant 2008; Young 1999) also complemented Hagedorn notion.

### 2.4.4. Race and ethnicity of inmates

The literature on ethnicity concurs that race plays a part in institutional violence and misconduct in that gangs form along racial lines (Carrol 1982; Chaiken 2000). Correctional facilities in the US are dominated by racial aspects to such an extent that the prison code formalises self-protective groups (gangs) along racial lines. This phenomenon is so obvious that new inmates immediately know with which group to associate themselves.
A study conducted by Jacobs (1977) on a mass society of inmates in Statesville Penitentiary found a strong association of inmates along racial lines. He found that inmates preferred to maintain intra-racial associations amongst themselves. Inmates knew that they were not allowed to associate with inmates of other race categories. Harer and Steffensmeier (1996) and Hassine (2009) support the race perspective of Jacobs, stating that there is no ‘prison code’; they suggest that inmates divide along ethnic lines and this eventually develops into gangs.

Studies conducted by Poole and Regoli (1980), Ramirez (1983) and Cao, Zhao and Van Dine 1997) note two aspects of the race perspective; first, black inmates engaged in significantly more disciplinary infringements, and second, black inmates had more prior violations of violence than their Caucasian counterparts did. Poole and Regoli (1980:940) and Steiner and Wooldredge (2009; 2015:183) found that black inmates with prior violations posed a greater threat of subsequent violations than those who had no prior violations.

In a study conducted by Phillips (2012:63) on gang narratives in two English prisons revealed that political significance Muslim inmates also form social cohesion groups or gangs due to labelling and out of fear about radicalization and terrorism (Phillips 2012). Similar findings on the racial phenomenon were found by Ralph’s et.al. (2009) and Kassel (2004) refer to it as cultural stereotyping.

The racial aspect of violence and misconduct in correctional centres is not only a United States phenomenon, but also noted in other countries. Studies on the race phenomenon in correctional centres in South Africa are non-existent, although some studies mentioned race as a dominant factor that may enhance gang activities, without giving empirical evidence. The race variable was detected in several studies involving street gangs in South Africa. In this regard, Pinnock (1984), Smit (1985) Kinnes (2000), Jensen (2008) and Petrus (2013) are the most prominent. Most of these studies were conducted in the Eastern and Western Cape because gang activities were more prevalent in these areas, specifically within the ‘coloured’ communities.

Jensen (2008) suggests that street gangs are formed based on the socio-economic and socio-cultural status of a particular community. Unemployment and informal
commercial activities in societies quickly achieve the status of normal, and create a breeding ground for anti-social groups that may develop into gangs. This perception was consistent among most of the researchers mentioned above, who also point to drug addiction as one of the results of normlessness that easily develops among such societies.

A different perspective was highlighted by Petrus (2013), who states that street gangs will continue to exist in coloured communities because of historical labelling by other ethnic groups and even by coloured people themselves. Gangs, according to this perspective, are a ‘coloured inheritance’. Petrus further postulates that due to poverty and unemployment in most of these societies, gangs easily integrate themselves into informal commercial activities, which provides a platform for illegal trading in drugs and alcohol. They become indispensable to the community because they provide resources and other services that legitimate structures are unable to provide.

The perceptions of the authors mentioned supra have not, however, been empirically tested within the correctional environment. This study will conduct an in-depth analysis to determine whether the race variable is also a factor amongst institutional gangs.

2.5. The social system of the correctional centre

The social system of the correctional centre is determined by the formal organisation of the correctional centre (Schurink 1989). The social system refers to the norms and values attached to the correctional environment that inmates must deal with on a daily basis. According to Inciardi (1993:568), exposure to the social system of the institutional community is almost immediate, for all new inmates become quickly aware of the norms and values that are shared by their fellow captives. Individuals who find themselves confined to this community for any period show a need to express themselves within this community. The nature of an individual’s self-expression will be based on his moral development and how he learned or executed social rules in a particular situation.

The harsh punitive measures imposed on inmates during imprisonment force inmates to develop their own subculture, where they can ameliorate the harsh
control measures that the system inflicts on them, and make life easier. Clemmer (1940:295) describes the inmate subculture as a social system with a strong class system, a strict code of behaviour and a value system that conflicts with the values of the prison establishment. This inmate subculture is also referred to as the ‘prison code’.

2.5.1. The prison code

The ‘prison code’ idea developed by Clemmer (1940:295) refers to a special code of behaviour that inmates develop over the years to deal with the adverse conditions of the correctional environment. The ‘inmate code’ is the mores or customs inmates create to unify and strengthen themselves against the administration or management of the correctional centre. According to Ohlin in Gillespie (2003:40), the ‘inmate code’ is a normative system that represents the organisation of criminal values that are in opposition to the values of conventional society.

The code prohibits inmates from engaging with correctional officials and it respects those who are in conflict with the correctional system. The ‘inmate code’ is not a formal, documented code, but a subculture that inmates use during daily routine activities. Over the years, the ‘prison code’, which was once characterised by a single culture, has spawned smaller social units that coalesce around core issues such as culture, shared pre-prison experiences, shared prison interests (such as education), race, criminal orientation and forced proximity (Messinger 2005:58). These small groups later form cliques that become gangs in correctional centres. Institutional gangs in South Africa follow the same principles, in that members are expected to be obedient and loyal to the gang and not to ‘snitch’ or cooperate with authorities (Lötter & Schurink 1984:67).

2.5.2. Conceptualisation of gangs

To understand the history, origins and nature of gangs, it is essential to consider the defining criteria of a gang. Several definitions for gangs exist and none of them is conclusive or all encompassing. Gangs include street gangs, street corner gangs, inner-city gangs, urban gangs, suburban gangs, rural gangs, male gangs, female gangs, juvenile gangs, youth gangs, delinquent gangs, criminal gangs, outlaw gangs,
biker gangs, drug gangs and prison gangs. There is a lack of consensus in defining
gangs because researchers cannot agree on what constitutes a gang or gang
behaviour (Esbensen et al. 2001:106; Shelden et al. 2004).

Thrasher (1963:46) developed the first definition, proposing the term ‘gang’ as an
interstitial group originally formed spontaneously, and then integrated through
conflict. The behaviour that characterises a gang includes meeting face-to-face,
milling, movement through space as a unit, conflict and planning. In his definition, he
refers to a group of young children in a neighbourhood, who used to play together
frequently, as the possible genesis of a gang. As the interests of the group change,
such a childhood grouping may become a deviant or delinquent gang.

Abercrombie et al. (1984:178) argue that the term ‘gang’ refers to a small group that
is bound together through a common sense of loyalty and territory, and which is
hierarchically structured around a gang leader. Regulus (1995:1047) added another
definition, stating that a gang constitutes a collection of individuals who meet and
associate primarily around a shared social – not political or economic – collective
identity and purpose. Knox (1991:1) refers to this phenomenon as a ‘social gang’,
which at first has only one common goal, which is to socialise as a group of friends.
The interests of this social gang, depending on circumstances, might change later to
the point where it becomes a criminal gang. According to Knox, the essential feature
of a criminal gang is that a criminal gang ‘routinely engages in law violation
behaviour’.

Cloward and Ohlin (1960:1) postulate that the terms ‘gangs’ and ‘subcultures’ exist
under the same umbrella. According to them, there are three kinds of gang
subcultures. First, the ‘criminal subculture’, where the primary objective is to secure
an income by any means, usually illegal, such as theft and extortion. Second, the
‘conflict subculture,’ which predominantly involves violence as a way of manipulation
and triumph, whether over rival gangs or innocent bystanders. The third subculture is
the ‘retreatist subculture’ where the dominant feature is the consumption of drugs.
Even though the three gang subcultures are mentioned independently, gangs might
exhibit a combination of the three subcultures; e.g., a group may deal in drugs to
obtain money (a criminal subculture) and defend their territorial area with violence if
needed (a conflict subculture).
Cloward and Ohlin (1960) go further and distinguish between delinquent and deviant gangs, referring to the ‘delinquent subculture’ and the ‘deviant subculture.’ The deviant subculture encompasses all behaviour that violates a set of social expectations or rules of conduct, including white-collar crime, damage to property and indecent behaviour. The delinquent subculture operates when a group violates a legal code or commits a crime (Cloward & Ohlin 1960:7).

Regarding institutional gangs, Hayden (2004) states that institutional gangs are more structured than those on the streets, because they involve a proper leadership structure and code of conduct, while street gangs’ membership constitutes more of a lifestyle, deriving chiefly from emotion. According to Knox (1991), they are the same, the only difference being that street gangs operate in a community and institutional gangs operates in a correctional centre. Lötter and Schurink (1984) postulate that institutional gangs are characterised as secondary groups linked by politics, race and religion, known for their immense size, charismatic leadership and bureaucratic organisation style (Lötter & Schurink 1984). Pyrooz et. al. (2011:4) postulates that prison gangs are more selective, secretive, criminally sophisticated, older, and violent than street gangs (Pyrooz, Decker, & Fleisher 2011: 4).

It is evident that there are several explanations surrounding what really constitutes a gang. However, irrespective of the differences in definitions by various researchers, there are some commonalities that define a gang. These can be summarised as follows; a gang is a group of individuals, comprising three or more members, that shares a common goal, engages in misbehaviour or criminal offenses and which operate within a specific domain, with a certain internal structure, whether formal or informal.

It is also evident that three different types of gangs can be distinguished; namely, the social gang, who mostly meet and associate around a common social identity, the deviant gang, which violates social expectations or rules of conduct and the delinquent gang, which violates a legal code or commits crime. The next section takes a closer look at gang subculture, specifically within the correctional environment.
2.5.3. Gangs in correctional facilities

The ‘prison code’ and later institutional gangs primarily exist as a means of self-protection from the administration and other manipulative inmates. The self-protection primarily ensures that the best interests of the group and its individual members are met. Conversely, the gang also provides lucrative opportunities to inmates who may join in order to expand their enterprises. The strength of a gang lies in the numbers; the bigger the membership, the more powerful it appears. The enterprises that inmates may be seeking to expand are their trading in unauthorised articles. Woods and Adler (2001:169) indicate that the primary motive of protection has evolved to that of power display and resourcefulness in dealing with forbidden commodities.

South African studies on gangs have, to a large extent, been conducted in communities (Dissel 2001; Gear 2010; Kinnes 2012; Oliver & Cunningham 2002; Peacock & Theron 2007; Petrus 2013; Standing 2005) and to a lesser extent in correctional centres (Gear & Ngubeni 2002; Haysom 1981; Lötter & Schurink 1984; Luyt 2001; Steinberg 2004). The literature from a community perspective focuses more on the geographical areas of the Western Cape and Eastern Cape. The reason that these geographical areas were selected is that gang activities are rife in these areas and also that gangs are particularly prominent in coloured communities in these areas. The literature on institutional gangs is mostly descriptive in nature, outlining gang organisation characteristics of South African institutional gangs.

2.5.4. Historical overview of gangs in South Africa

Lötter and Schurink (1984) point out that most early literature on gangs indicates that gangs are an American product, but it was discovered that the numbers gangs started in South Africa as early as 1900 by a man named Palo Mabaso. Haysom (1981:1) postulates that the numbers gangs’ historic roots make them distinctive because they are not spontaneous cliques banding together, but have a structure, ranking and disciplinary code that pre-dates the South African Correctional Services. Steinberg (2004) supports the historical background by indicating that the ‘numbers gangs’ are more than one hundred years old and that they originated in the mine
compounds and informal settlements of Johannesburg. Today they constitute a formidable force in every correctional centre across South Africa.

According to Steinberg (2004), the numbers gangs comprise six different gangs, of which the 26, 27, and the 28 gangs appear to be the most prominent. According to researchers (Gear & Ngubeni, 2002; Haysom 1981; Lötter & Schurink 1984; Neser 1989), the numbers gangs originate on the streets; after most of their members were incarcerated, they continued their operations in the correctional centres. This is particularly the case for the 27 and 28 gangs. The other numbers gangs – 26 gang, Big 5, Airforce 23 and Airforce 24 – later developed from these two gangs inside the correctional centres. The Big 5 gang and the Airforce 24 gang originated from the 28 gang and Air force 23 originated from the 26 gang (Gear & Ngubeni 2002; Haysom 1981; Lötter & Schurink 1984; Neser 1989).

The South African numbers gangs are very distinct from other institutional gangs. Extensive national gang networks characterise the numbers gangs, where members have membership for life and where membership is not dictated or determined by geographical area. Gang members further maintain their seniority regardless of whether they are in prison or have been released. South African gangs have a strong military hierarchal structure that demands absolute loyalty and obedience to the structure of command. Failing or challenging this command structure incurs severe punishments, including death (Parker-Lewis 2006:27).

2.5.5. Different types of institutional gangs in correctional centres

According to Engelbrecht (2014:4) the numbers gangs that operate in South African correctional centres are well-structured and independent entities that rule with authority to such an extent that they can instruct members to harm fellow inmates. This notion was supported by Adams (2014: 2–3) and Mapumulo (2011:17). From the historical background of the gangs, it is evident that the numbers gangs do not have conflicting goals or objectives. The 26 gang are involved with money (obtaining goods by means of cunning), the 27 gang with blood (assaults), and the 28 gang with poison, referring to ‘wyfies’ (wives), blood and to rectifying harsh conditions inside the ‘four corners’ of the institution (Schurink 1989).
According to Parker-Lewis (2003:170), the 26 gang are sneaky institutional thieves who operate under the dollar sign during the daylight hours. Schurink et al. (1984:23) found that the procurement of money and other goods, through trickery and not violence, is seen as the main function of the 26 gang. Gang members do not engage in violence unless there is a severe threat to the camp. The gang operates at three different levels and has a militaristic, hierarchical structure. The first level is the deep level; they are the soldiers that protect the gang and are responsible for daily activities. The second level are the ‘number two’s’ who are responsible for supervising and training the deep levels, and the third level are the ‘stairs’ which makes vital decisions and enforce discipline in the gang.

The 27 gang is the smallest of all the gangs but they are very lethal and dangerous. They are seen as the overseers and enforcers of the gang codes applicable to the 26s and 28s. As Parker-Lewis (2003:170) points out, the 27s are a silent and selective breed that enforce the codes of the numbers gangs and fight on behalf of the 26 gang, who should not be involved in blood. Gear and Ngubeni (2002:5) found that the 27s offer protection to the 26s in return for material goods and consumables (Gear & Ngubeni 2002:5). The 27 gang operates according to the same structure as the 26 gang and when there are no 27 gang members at a specific centre, they will operate under the 26 gang structure.

The 28 gang are men of the night; their symbol is the sunset (Haysom 1981:11). The 28 gang consists of two divisions, namely Silver Line and the Gold Line. The Gold Line, also known as the Red Line, comprises members who protect the gang. They are the individuals who participate in gang fights and they act as the men in the camp. They are also entitled to a ‘wyfie’ (a wife). According to Lewis (2006), the fighters are not scared to take blood and these gang members are regarded as the sex predators and perpetrators in prison (Parker-Lewis 2006:78). The Silver Line is divided into two camps; the one being the ‘wyfies’ for the Gold Line and the other being the ‘intellectuals’ who look after administrative matters and the well-being of the gang.

A study conducted by Peacock & Theron (2007) indicated that 71% of the inmates in their study did belonged to gangs. They also found that they joined these gangs because their friends belonged to these gangs (Peacock & and Theron 2007).
2.5.6. Structure of gangs

The numbers gangs are well organised with nothing haphazard about their structure; each has a gang code that is unique to each gang (Parker-Lewis 2003:169). According to Parker-Lewis (2006:27), the difference between the South African institutional gangs and those from other countries is that South African gangs have created their own imaginary reality, with a distinctive history, a coded language, roles, rules, rituals, mythologies and even invisible clothes which only the initiated can identify. The numbers gangs are authoritarian in structure and characterised by violence and intense rivalry for power and control. Lötter and Schurink (1984:91) identified institutional functions, such as recruitment, promotion, management, communication, structures, warfare and sex systems, in which institutional gangs are employed for purposes of goal attainment.

2.5.6.1. The rank structure

The numbers gangs in South Africa have a hierarchy model and each gang has its own structure. Schurink (1989) indicates that each number gang has a management body, which is called the ‘twelve points’ (Schurink 1989). The gang operates with strict communication channels. The 26 and the 27 gangs have three different levels on which they operate. The first level is referred to as the ‘deep level.’ This level accommodates the soldiers and new recruits that enter the camp. The second level is the ‘number two’s’, responsible for overseeing the deep levels and executing discipline, and the third level are the ‘stairs’ which constitute the management of the gang. They are responsible for ensuring the smooth running of the gang and for disciplining members in serious matters. The ‘twelve points’ operate on each level, with the top structure forming the ‘twelve points’. The 28 gang have the same principles but they have four levels that operate along two lines, the ‘Silver’ and the ‘Gold’, as explained above (Schurink 1989).

2.5.6.2. Recruitment

Researchers have identified several attributes that distinguish the numbers gangs from their other gang counterparts. The first notable difference is the recruitment strategy of the numbers gangs. According to Schurink (1989) one of the most
important ways in which the survival of the numbers gangs is insured is the recruitment strategy. Each gang has a unique recruitment strategy that is very secretive. Gang members are not allowed to disclose this information because if everyone knows it, it could compromise the gang’s continuous existence. Schurink (1989) indicates that recruits are taught that they came to the gang with their own feet, their whole heart and their full mind. From this statement it is evident that joining any number gangs are voluntary, done out of an individual’s free will. Once a person has joined, he cannot get out; ‘blood in, blood out’.

2.5.6.3. **Promotion**

Promotion usually takes place from one rank to the next, but in some circumstances, individuals may skip certain ranks due to good behaviour and knowledge of gang laws. Lötter and Schurink (1984) indicate that the 28 gang rank structure consists of twenty-eight different ranks and the 26 and 27 gang have twenty ranks. Schurink (1989) indicates that the structures of the numbers gangs determine the lines of communication between gang members to a great extent. The rank that an individual attains in a gang is a life-time rank, irrespective of whether the individual is incarcerated or released. The individual also holds his rank when transferred from one correctional centre to another (Haysom 1981).

An individual who is due for promotion is also subjected to certain rituals. Haysom (1981) states that promotion is in certain cases coupled with bloedvat. (blood taking). Bloedvat implies that the gang member has to assault a fellow inmate or correctional official before the promotion goes ahead. The rank structure of the numbers gangs is an imaginary structure that is highly secretive to the gang. A gang’s continuous existence depends on the secrecy of the members. For each rank in the gang there is a unique uniform and secret code (umvughu) which only that individual, his peers and members higher up in the structure know. When an individual is due for promotion, a formal ceremony will be conducted by the highest meeting of ‘twelve points’. The individual will then be issued with a new secret code and uniform associated with the new rank, which must be known from the heart.
2.5.6.4. Discipline/ punishment

The numbers gangs have a strict code of conduct and failure to abide by the rules has severe consequences for the perpetrator. The numbers gangs consist of various levels that enforce discipline in the gang. The nature of an offence will determine where the case will be heard. In the case of minor cases, the ‘twelve points’ of the specific division will deal with the matter, but in serious matters, the highest meeting will take a decision (Gear & Ngubeni 2002).

The outcome of the hearing will determine the appropriate punishment. Schurink (1989) lists five different types of punishment that can be imposed on a member who transgresses the code of the gang. These vary from a warning, skoeps (excessive water intake by the individual and several blows to the stomach), gang rape, bloedvat stabbing or assault, and the death penalty. The two last-mentioned punishments are the most severe and are issued for very serious transgressions (Schurink 1989).

2.6. Characteristics of gang member versus non-gang members

The previous section discussed the extent to which institutional gangs operate in correctional centres and gave reasons why some inmates join these gangs. Not all inmates end up joining gangs even though they are exposed to the same circumstances as those who do. Inmates who choose the ‘doing time’ and ‘gleaning’ adaptation approach are usually those who steer clear of joining gangs. These inmates relate to the legitimate subculture of the importation model; they accept the rules and regulations of the institution and avail themselves of rehabilitation programmes (Irwin & Cressey 1962:139).

Prior research has identified several attributes that distinguish the non-gang member from their counterparts. These attributes are associated with the three theoretical perspectives that were discussed previously; they include length of sentence, prior criminal history, type of offence, employment history and family ties. A detailed discussion was presented under the importation perspective under section 1.2.
2.7. Theoretical conception of inmate misconduct and gang membership

The literature referred to earlier on the importation, deprivation and situational contextual perspectives indicates that an inmate’s institutional misconduct and gang membership may arise as a result of institutional (social and cultural) dynamics or individual-level characteristics which the inmate imports into the correctional centre. Data presented on the deprivation (Sykes 1958) and situational contextual (Steinke 1991) perspectives indicate that the physical, social and cultural characteristics of the correctional environment significantly contribute to inmates’ deviant and delinquent behaviour in a correctional centre. Depriving inmates of fundamental needs has a severe impact on how they react to stressors within a correctional centre. Deprivation and stress combine to create an easy platform for institutional gangs to convince inmates that being a gang member during incarceration is the only option to ensure a sustainable life in the centre.

In addition to the aspect of deprivation, research shows that factors such as overcrowding (Worrall & Morris 2011), sentence length (Wooldredge & Steiner 2009), substance addictions (Steiner et al. 2014: 462) and security classification contribute to inmates’ deviant and delinquent behaviours. Conversely, although these studies identified these variables as contributors towards inmates’ deviant and delinquent behaviours, they failed to indicate ‘how’ and ‘why’ they contributed to such behaviours. For overcrowding, findings presented by the various researchers were mostly general conclusions, wherein they found a relationship between institutional misconduct and overcrowding. A detailed discussion on the nature of the relationship between overcrowding and institutional misconduct or gang membership was missing. Similar conclusions can be drawn from the studies that mentioned sentence length, substance abuse and security classification as factors associated with misconduct.

Regarding the situational contextual concept, Steinke (1991) indicated that the structural and control dynamics, such as institutional control, prison architecture, staff characteristics (Molleman & van der Broek 2014) and inmate social systems, could positively contribute towards inmates’ deviant and delinquent behaviour. The
findings presented on the various dynamics indicate that the situational contextual concept also applies to inmates’ institutional misconduct and gang membership. Most of the variables discussed in this concept overlap with the deprivation perspective, but two important aspects may be noted from the literature: Institutional control and staff characteristics have fundamental impacts of inmates’ misconduct and gang membership, and, in addition, the literature makes general conclusions on these variables. It provides descriptions of how an ideal correctional centre staff behaves and an ideal management style for correctional centres, but does not discuss the actual application of the variables.

In the importation perspective, Irvin and Cressey (1962) asserted that inmates import their negative or anti-social values and beliefs into a correctional setting. The importation model recognised three categories of subculture at the individual level, which manifested prior to incarceration and explain prison violence and misconduct. The importation perspective was later further developed and additional variables, i.e., age (Cunningham & Sorensen 2007: 252), criminal history (Esbensen et al. 2001:128), socio economic status (Lee et al. 2004:29), marital status, current crime (Wooldredge, Griffin & Pratt 2001), race and substance abuse (Drury & DeLisi, 2010:351) were added to predict inmate misconduct in correctional centres. In the application of the variables, the studies found that these variables had a general application as causes of institutional misconduct and violence, but failed to indicate ‘how’ and ‘why’ they contributed to such behaviours.

The social environment of the correctional centre is a very complex one which stems from the dynamic of having one party striving to enforce rules and regulations (the administration), and the other party not wanting to be there (inmates). Findings in the literature on the social environment of correctional centres indicate that this environment has transformed significantly over the years, from having one central code (prison code) for behaviour to having several smaller groups (gangs), each with its own code. These smaller social groups become formalised to such extent that they have a formal hierarchy and rank systems, all with one objective; to take control over the social environment and to overthrow the administration of the centre. On the other hand, there is also the centre administration with the mandate to control the
social environment. The failure to effectively control the social environment provides a platform for these smaller social groups, also referred to as gangs, to expand on their operations.

Taken together and given the circumstances, it is evident that there is a serious need to revisit the theoretical perspectives discussed above in order to conduct a more in-depth analysis on the respective variables. The perspectives leave theoretical gaps in their explanation of the phenomenon of inmate misconduct. The aim of this study is to fill in these theoretical gaps; hence the specific objectives of the study are:

- To provide a more detailed explanation of the variables identified in the importation, deprivation and situational contextual perspectives, in terms of how and why they contribute to institutional misconduct and gang membership;
- To provide a more in-depth application of the situational contextual model on institutional control and staff characteristics;
- To revisit existing strategies to control institutional misconduct and gang membership in the correctional centre; and
- To provide a theoretical model based on the various perspective that is unique to the South African context.

2.8. Conclusion

The complexity of the correctional environment is evident from the literature, given that two contesting forces, namely, the inmates and the centre administration, dominate this environment. The effectiveness of controlling the social environment rests upon two broad pillars; namely, the individual-level characteristics of the inmates (according to the importation model) and the social and cultural dynamic of the correctional centre (according to the deprivation and situational contextual models).

The literature review has identified various knowledge gaps that will be addressed by this study to provide a more in-depth analysis of the phenomenon of inmate misconduct in correctional centres across the country. To achieve the objective of the study, it will apply the Social Structure and Social Learning theoretical
perspective, which focuses on how and why individuals become deviant or delinquent in their micro and macro environments. This theoretical concept will be discussed in the next chapter.
Chapter 3: Theoretical Framework

3.1. Introduction

The previous chapter provided an in-depth literature review on the dynamics of the correctional centre that contribute towards violent and deviant behaviour in correctional centres. The literature indicated that inmates’ deviant or delinquent behaviour depends of two dynamics, namely, the individual-level characteristics of the inmates (importation perspective) and the social, cultural and structural characteristics of the correctional centre (deprivation and situational contextual perspectives). In the application of the various theoretical concepts, the study identified some knowledge gaps that, once filled, would improve understanding of the phenomenon.

To provide a better understanding of inmate misconduct in correctional centres, the study selected Akers’ (1998) Social Structure and Social Learning theory as the most appropriate theory. The theory focuses on two concepts; first, the Social Learning concept, which postulates that inmates learn their deviant behaviour from others. Based on this concept, the study will explore the importation variables identified previously to understand how and why individuals engage in deviant behaviour. Secondly, there is the Social Structure concept, which postulates that the social structure of a society has a significant impact on how individuals learn their behaviour in their immediate environment. Based on this concept, the study will explore the deprivation and situational contextual concepts and how they actually contribute to individuals’ deviant behaviour.

3.2. Theoretical background

The Social Structure and Social Learning (SSSL) theory originates from Sutherland’s (1947) Differential Social Association theory and Burgess and Akers’ (1966) Differential Association-Reinforcement theory. Although the SSSL model is more relevant to society in general, it can also be applied to the correctional environment, since a correctional environment can be seen as a unique society with its own set of norms and values.
Individual behaviour is developed on the basis of three aspects; the biological/cognitive functions, the subculture, and the cultural and social structures that function within a particular community. Human behaviour is naturally, biologically integral to a person, and the individual’s interactions with others in their immediate broader social environments shape the individual’s needs and desires. An individual’s needs and desires arise from their motivations, drives and attitudes. In Thomas’s (1923; 1967) notion of the four wishes, he postulates that human behaviour contains four basic motivations which originate in human biology, and that the nature of specific ‘wishes’ varies from individual to individual. The four basic wishes are the desire for security, the desire for response (approval from others), the desire for new experiences and the desire for recognition (status). Additionally, humans possess innate drives, such as those related to hunger or reproduction (Thomas 1923; 1967). These wishes or drives mentioned by Thomas are motivated and developed based on exposure to forces in the immediate and social environments of the individual, and can be socially approved (conforming) or deviant.

The immediate and social environments refer to the norms and values that family and communities develop over the years. As individuals mature within these environments, they accept values and norms that are attractive to them. Individuals transform under the influences of their natural environment (cognitive/biological factors) and family and community cultural attitudes. Thomas and Znaniecki (1966) describe this as a process of social regulation, which results in the transforming of natural attitudes into socially conditioned cultural attitudes (Thomas & Znaniecki 1966). Cultural attitudes, according to Proctor (2010:23), differ from natural attitudes in several key ways; first, cultural attitudes tend to be organised, and as a result, social events or situations may satisfy a wide array of human needs, and enable their fulfilment at one time. Second, cultural attitudes tend to be reflected, remembered and repeated. Third, cultural attitudes allow for the more permanent subordination of other attitudes than is possible with natural attitudes, which are more susceptible to impulsivity. Fourth, just as natural attitudes are biological in nature, cultural attitudes are social in nature and depend upon the social environments to which one has been exposed. Lastly, cultural attitudes can become
relatively fixed over time and as a result an individual may have a difficult time acquiring new cultural attitudes (Proctor 2010).

The developing of individual behaviour will depend on interaction between the cognitive/biological aspects (the natural environment) and cultural attitudes. Proctor (2010:25) cited that Sutherland’s Differential Association theory (1947) on criminal behaviour does not associate such behaviour with either natural attitudes or with particular social values, but with both natural attitudes and social values. Such behaviours are emergent phenomena, not reducible to either biological drives or social values. Sutherland’s Differential Association theory is based on three assumptions, namely; human nature is built upon a biological foundation, the social environment shapes human nature, and human nature is an emergent property of biological and social forces that is irreducible to either force.

Burgess and Akers (1966) declare that Sutherland’s Differential Association theory is deficient in that it fails to specify how individuals actually learn criminal behaviour (Burgess & Akers 1966). Burgess and Akers (1966) introduced a new differential-association/differential-reinforcement theory of criminal behaviour, stating that Differential Association theory, in terms of behavioural principles, relates to operant conditioning. Operant conditioning holds that behaviours are learned as a result of punishments or rewards associated with particular behaviours that arise in response to particular stimuli. They introduced the modalities of association (frequency, duration, intensity, and priority) and the terms ‘favourable’ or ‘unfavourable’ to explain criminal behaviour. They suggest that individuals’ deviant or conformed behaviour is determined based on the modalities of association and the negative or positive stimuli that provoke such behaviour.

Differential Association theory was not static, and Akers (1985; 2009) began to incorporate ideas from psychological Social Learning theory (Bandura 1977), such as vicarious learning and self-regulation, into the theory. The cognitive components associated with criminal behaviour again became a point of emphasis and the theory became increasingly referred to as ‘Social Learning theory’ (Akers 2009). Social learning theory specifies that four major factors are associated with the genesis of criminal or deviant behaviours: differential associations, differential reinforcements (both social and non-social), behavioural modelling (vicarious learning) and
definitions favourable to deviant/criminal behaviour (deviant/criminal cognitions) (Akers 2009).

In 1998, Akers introduced the Social Structure and Social Learning theory that integrated individual behaviour with the social and environmental conditions that may affect an individual’s behaviour. The Social Structure and Social Learning theory will now be discussed in detail as a theoretical approach to understand the correctional environment.

3.3. Social Structural and Social Learning theory (SSSL)

The Social Structure and Social Learning (SSSL) theory attempts to combine the structural explanations of crime with the procession theory of individual behaviour (Akers 1998). Akers (1998) postulates that the SSSL theory’s basic assumption is that social learning is the primary process linking social structure to individual behaviour. Its main proposition is that variations in the social structure, culture and locations of individuals and groups in the social system explain variations in crime rates, principally through their influence on differences within individuals in their social learning (Akers 1998:322).

The SSSL theory consists of two broad aspects, namely the Social Learning theory and the Social Structure theory. The Social Learning theory is based on four dimension as mentioned earlier; differential associations, differential reinforcements, behavioural modelling and definitions. The Social Structure theory is based on differential social organisation, differential social location in the social structure, theoretically defined structural causes and differential location in primary, secondary and reference groups. These theoretical models and their integrated explanations will be discussed in detail below.

3.3.1. Social Learning theory (SLT)

Social Learning theory is a way of explaining human behaviour that embraces the personal and ecological variables that cause the initiation, maintenance and cessation of both conforming and deviant behaviour (Akers 1998). Through social learning, individuals are able to observe and learn new things and develop new
behaviours by observing other people, also referred to as the observational learning process. Akers and Burgess (1966) pronounce that behaviour is learned as a result of punishments and rewards associated with particular behaviours undertaken in response to particular stimuli. Their theory of differential association/reinforcement pronounces that deviant behaviour is learned in both non-social situations and through social interaction, but that most learning is a result of social interaction within groups. This new perspective resulted in the revisiting of the nine propositions of Sutherland’s learning theory; Akers and Burgess reduced these to seven statements (Akers 1998:45):

- Criminal behaviour is learned according to the principles of operant conditioning.
- Criminal behaviour is learned both in non-social situations that are reinforcing or discriminative and through social interactions, in which the behaviour of the other person either reinforces or discriminates against criminal behaviour.
- The principal part of the learning of criminal behaviour occurs in those groups that comprise the individual’s major source of reinforcement.
- The learning of criminal behaviour, including specific techniques, attitudes, and avoidance procedures, is a function of the effective and available reinforcers, and the existing reinforcement contingencies.
- The specific class of behaviours which are learned and their frequency of occurrence are a function of the reinforcers which are effective and available, and the rules or norms by which these reinforcers are applied.
- Criminal behaviour is a function of norms that are discriminative for criminal behaviour, the learning of which takes place when such behaviour is more highly reinforced than non-criminal behaviour.
- The strength of criminal behaviour is a direct function of the amount, frequency and probability of its reinforcement (Akers 1998:45).

The Differential Association Reinforcement theory was later further developed, when Akers incorporated ideas of psychological social learning, vicarious learning, self-regulation and cognitive components associated with criminal behaviour (Akers
This theory was later called the Social Learning theory, and consisted of four major components, namely:

- Differential association;
- Differential reinforcement (both social and non-social);
- Definitions (favourable to deviant/criminal behaviour or criminal cognitions);
  and
- Behavioural modelling/vicarious learning (Imitation)

### 3.3.1.1. Differential association

Differential association is the process by which an individual in a particular social context is exposed to definitions favourable or unfavourable to committing criminal or delinquent acts. Akers (1997) stated that differential association has both a behavioural interactional and normative dimension. The interactional dimension refers to the direct association and interaction an individual has with others who engage in certain kinds of behaviour, as well as the indirect association and identification with more distant reference groups. The normative dimension refers to the different patterns of norms and values to which an individual is exposed through this association. The groups with which one is in differential association provide the major social context in which all mechanisms of social learning operate (Akers 1997:64).

This exposure and association comes in the form of modalities of association. The modalities of associations refer to the frequency, duration, priority and intensity of the individual’s involvement:

- Frequency and duration relate to the amount of time spent in association with others. More specifically, the more one associates with peers and the longer one has these associations, the more likely it is that the individual will adopt similar behaviour.
- Priority refers to how early in childhood certain associations form, with the assumption that associations that form earlier in childhood will have more influence and a longer-lasting effect on behaviour and definitions than associations formed later.
• Finally, intensity refers to the importance of, and closeness, commitment or loyalty to a peer or peer group, with more intense associations being more likely to influence behaviour or definitions (Akers 1998).

In the correctional environment, whether or not individuals engage in institutional misconduct and gang activities depends on the individual’s modalities of association and the impact of their primary relationships. Should the individual’s social activities be dominated by criminal activities, the probability is that everyone in the group will engage in such activities. It is recognised generally that while reference and symbolic relationships influence socialisation, it is the early life primary and secondary associations with parents and peer groups that exercise the most direct control over reinforcement for conforming or deviant behaviour.

The primary associations refer to the early life associations, and the middle childhood years upon which parental relationships have the most critical effect for the development of antisocial behaviour (Patterson & Yoerger 1997). Specific concerns are the effects of coercive, harsh, lax or erratic parenting styles in which children are conditioned to select antisocial versus pro-social behavioural responses as early as their preschool years (Patterson & Yoerger 1997).

Secondary relationships with deviant peers are also commonly recognised as contributing to the development of antisocial behaviour through the processes of peer rejection, peer selection, peer interaction and deviancy training (the way in which antisocial behaviour and delinquency are supported through interactions with a deviant peer group) (Dishion, Patterson & Griesler 1994).

3.3.1.2. Differential reinforcement

Within Social Learning theory, criminal behaviour is learned through operant conditioning in which criminal behaviour is either rewarded or punished. Differential reinforcement refers to the balance of anticipated or actual rewards and punishments that follow or are consequences of behaviour (Akers 1998). Whether the individual refrains from or commits a crime at any given time depends on the past, present, and anticipated future rewards and punishments for the certain actions. The
behaviour that is most successful in obtaining the desired result will become dominant over the less effective alternatives. The likelihood that behaviour will be performed in any particular situation and generalised to other situations is a function of the expectancy of reinforcement and the value of the reinforcers associated with that behaviour (Rotter 1982).

The individual’s observations, positive or negative, determine whether an individual will continue with such behaviour. Differential reinforcement directly applies to the socialisation and behaviour of gang members, when contingent physical, emotional and psychological reinforcers are present, as well as punishments related to the performance of undesirable behaviours (Winfree et al. 1994). Positive rewards and reinforcers result from actions that:

- demonstrate loyalty to the gang;
- bolster the gang's reputation among rival gangs or non-members;
- increase membership or otherwise enhance the gang's stability; and
- result in financial or other tangible gains for the gang and/or individual members.

Conversely, punishment results from:

- betraying or otherwise ‘disrespecting’ one's gang or its members;
- tolerating insults from rival gangs;
- demonstrating weakness or fear in the face of potential danger;
- cooperation with conventional authority figures (e.g., law enforcement or school personnel); and
- refusal to participate in gang-sanctioned activities (Winfree et al. 1994).

In South African correctional centres, inmates are subjected to a disciplinary code that prohibits them from certain acts, such as violence, deviant behaviour and substance abuse. Failure to comply results in inmates being subjected to disciplinary hearings or even criminal prosecution (Correctional Service Act 111 of 1998:23). Should the centre administration fail to reinforce disciplinary processes, inmates will not experience operant conditions for infringing the disciplinary code. Regular infringements of the disciplinary code can later become common tendencies and
inmates, especially gangs will take advantage of such circumstances. Inmates that belong to gangs and other manipulative inmates will target vulnerable inmates and victimise or assault them. The vulnerable inmates will feel insecure and will be forced to defend themselves through violence or else join gangs for protection.

3.3.1.3. *Imitation*

Imitation, also referred to as observational learning or vicarious learning, is a process through which the observed rewards and consequences experienced by others influence the socialisation and behavioural choices made by observers (Bandura 1986). According to Akers, imitation tends to be more important in the initial stages of learning deviant behaviour, and less important for the maintenance and/or cessation of the behaviour. Furthermore, behaviour is strengthened through rewards or avoidance of punishment (Akers et al. 1979). An individual will model a particular behaviour that he or she finds favourable. Whether behaviour will be imitated or not depends on the characteristics of the person being observed, the behaviour the person engages in, and the observed consequences of that behaviour.

Vicarious learning depends upon the degree to which the individual holds a behavioural model in high esteem and the degree to which the model demonstrates pleasure in response to a particular stimulus (Akers 2009). Bandura describes the process of vicarious learning, where an individual first observes a model engaging in some form of behaviour, the salient characteristics of the model, and the reward or punishment attached to the behaviour (Bandura 1977).

The imitation model is relevant to gang culture, in that the social context and structure of gangs (e.g., group-oriented rites of initiation, criminality, violence and highly visible processes of differential reinforcement) provide a mechanism through which young and/or new members' attitudes and behaviours are achieved through the effects of observational learning (Boerman 2002:18).

Imitation may also have a secondary effect in shaping the behaviour of a group as a whole, as individuals who have been vicariously influenced begin to act as models for others that have not observed directly the rewards and costs associated with particular behaviours (Bandura 1962). Institutional gangs have certain rituals, such as initiation, and the ‘blood in, blood out’ concept that forms an integral part of the
gang culture, and the perceptions and behaviours of new members will be shaped and reinforced through storytelling and mythmaking. Gang culture is rich with symbols (e.g., gang colours, clothing, graffiti, art and jewellery) and behaviours (hand gestures, physical posturing, speech, sustained eye contact) that serve as discriminative stimuli for the occurrence of gang-sanctioned behaviours, and which reinforce the attitudes, processes, and structures that affect group cohesion and shape member behaviour (Boerman 2002:19).

3.3.1.4. Definitions

Definitions are ‘orientations, rationalisations, definitions of the situation, and other evaluative and moral attitudes that define the commission of an act as right or wrong, good or bad’ (Akers 1998: 65). These definitions reflect the morals, values and norms that are favourable to conforming behaviour and unfavourable to committing deviant behaviour. The more positive rather than negative definitions one acquires toward criminal or delinquent acts, the more likely it is that one will refrain from committing such acts. Definitions serve as cues that make one more willing to commit an act, given anticipated reinforcement or punishment behaviour (Akers 1998).

The likelihood of an individual committing delinquent behaviour depends on the situation the individual encounters and what orientation and skills that individual has to neutralise the situation from a moral perspective. The behaviour generated from observational learning and operant learning determines whether the individual will act favourably or unfavourably to law violation in a particular situation.

Skills can be considered a form of definition because, within a situation, they orient the actions of an individual. Skills need not be specific to a particular crime, although for particular crimes specific skills may be required, and skills vary in terms of complexity. In addition to skills, motives and attitudes, another definition is neutralisation. Like all definitions, neutralisations may precede or succeed a criminal act (Akers 2009).

It should be noted that definitions of ‘desirable and conforming’ and ‘deviant and non-conforming’ are social constructs with no intrinsic validity, as each society or culture, including gang culture, defines and modifies over time its social norms and
the behavioural expectations of its members. Initially, social sanctions are applied through the process of external control. Eventually, however, application of social sanctions may lead to the development of self-control, where an individual learns from significant others the behaviours considered socially appropriate across a variety of conditions and social contexts. Within gangs, positive and negative sanctions are applied in response to desirable and undesirable behaviours (Winfree et al. 1994) in a manner that contributes to a process of socialisation, whereby members come to understand and conform to the norms of gang culture (Boerman 2002:22).

3.3.2. Social Structure (SS) theory

The social structure concept as the second component of the Social Learning and Social Structure (SSSL) theory is a cross-level integrated theory or theoretical elaboration of Social Learning theory that specifies the process and mechanism by which social structural (SS)-level variables affect individual deviant and criminal behaviours (Akers 1998:330). Its main proposition is that variations in the social structure, culture and locations of individuals and groups in the social system explain variations in crime rates, principally through their influence on differences within individuals in the social learning variables.

A key concept in Social Structure and Social Learning (SSSL) is that social learning (SL) is based on the micro-level influences on individual behaviour which include parents, siblings and neighbours, whereas the social structure (SS) is the macro-level influences of individual behaviour, which include parks, school and community culture. The theoretical model emphasises that ‘social learning is the primary process linking social structure to individual behaviour’ (Akers 1998:322). The SSSL model suggests that variations in the social structure and locations of individuals explain variations in their conforming or deviant behaviour in the mediation of social learning constructs (Akers 1998).

Akers (1998:322) specifies four major dimensions of social structure that provide the contexts within which the social learning variables are hypothesised to operate:

- Structural correlates of crime, indicating differential social organisation;
- Socio-demographic and socioeconomic correlates of crime indicating differential social location in the social structure;
- Theoretically defined criminogenic aspects of the social structure, such as social disorganisation; and
- Differential social location in primary, secondary and reference groups (Akers 1998)

### 3.3.2.1. *Differential social organisation*

Differential social organisation refers to known causative aggregate-level characteristics of cultural, societal and geographical differences in crime rates (Akers 1998:332). The structural and the cultural characteristics of a particular community/society determine the level of crime (high or low) within such a community. According to Akers (1998:332), the variables that tap into some specific combination of features are the social organisation, culture and social background of the community or society. Therefore, these variables can be introduced into the model as part of, or independently of, a theoretical explanation. Further indicators of this concept include empirical correlates that have been used as statistical controls in prior macro-level studies, such as population size, density and other regional, geographic or economic social systems (Lee, Akers & Borg 2004).

In the correctional environment, variables such as overcrowding, population diversity and inmate custody levels can be associated with Lee et al.’s (2004) macro-level statistical controls such as population size and the geographical composition of the community. According to Akers (1998), the distinct social and demographic aspects of the community, such as the population size, composition, density, regional location, economic conditions and community type (rural, urban or suburban) have been related to crime and delinquency. The Minister of Correctional Services stated in his annual report that correctional centres are nationally 28% overcrowded, which compromises the health and safety of inmates in correctional centres (Minister of Correctional Services: Annual Report of the Department of Correctional Services: 2012/2013: 51). When cells are overcrowded, it affects the density of the cell and creates various frustrations and stressors amongst inmates, and can eventually end up in conflict situations and violence. As mentioned earlier, cells are controlled in
terms of sleeping arrangements between the various gangs, where fellow gang members will receive preference above non-gang members in terms of sleeping arrangements. If the management of the centre cannot control such situations, the gangs will control inmates, and they attain a stronghold over the entire centre.

3.3.2.2. **Differential social locations**

Differential social location refers to ‘social demographics’ or ‘social economic correlates’ that socially define or place people in macro-level social organisations or larger groupings, and other differentiations in societies and communities (Akers 1998:333). This aspect is commonly conceptualised as a direct individual crime causal factor, and is defined as ‘socio-cultural categories’ or ‘collectives,’ which indicate various categories of individuals in the social structure (Akers 1998:333). These indicators are gender, race, marital status, occupation, religion, age, class and socioeconomic status and other individual characteristics that characterise groups in society.

No previous measurements of the socio-demographic or socio-economic correlates of the differential social location exist for correctional centres, but the application of this dimension could bring some new insight into the phenomenon. The indicators identified by Akers (1998) in a societal context are similar to those applicable to a correctional environment. The indicators that might have an impact on the social environment of a correctional centre will be the variables that were earlier identified as individual-level characteristics, such as race, age, education and employment status.

3.3.2.3. **Theoretically defined structured variables**

Theoretically defined structural variables refer to crime causative constructs identified and drawn from ‘the well-known structural theories of crime and deviance that propose elevated rates in those societies, or segments of societies, that are hypothesized to have higher levels of some abstractly defined condition like anomie, conflict, social disorganisation, patriarchy or class oppression’ (Akers 1998:333).
3.3.2.4. **Social location: primary and secondary groups**

Differential social location in primary, secondary and reference groups refers to the meso-disorganisation indicators such as inequality, social class, poverty, population instability or others in relation to a particular community’s crime rates. According to Akers, the most relevant explanatory concepts are the theoretical variables drawn from social disorganisation theory and anomie theory (Akers 1998:30–334).

Differential social location in primary, secondary and reference groups refers to the meso-level or more immediate social contexts. These consist of primary or secondary groups and individual networks such as family, work groups, peer groups, church groups, reference groups and others to which one is affiliated or belongs (Akers 1998:335).

The level of attachment to societal values and norms plays a significant role in respect of which adaptation model the individual will adopt after incarceration (Irwin 1970). The level of attachment inmates have with the primary, secondary and reference groups also has a significant impact on how they will react within a correctional centre. If an inmate does not have any support or bond with the community, he may have no interest in going back to the community and may make the institution his home by joining gangs.

3.4. **Previous research on Social Structure and Social Learning theory**

The Social Learning and Social Structure theory has been subjected to a great deal of empirical research, but the integration of the two models within the theory is still limited. Researchers (Akers & Lee 1999; Bellair, Roscigno & McNulty 2003; Gibson, Poles & Akers 2010; Haynie, Silver & Teasdale 2006; Holland-Davis 2006; Lanza-Kaduce & Capece 2003; Lanza-Kaduce, Capece, & Alden 2006; Lee, Akers & Borg 2004; Verrill 2008; Wu, Eschbach & Gardy 2008) which found significant evidence supporting the Social Structure and Social Learning theory conducted several studies. The studies found that there was a positive relationship between variations in the social structure on social learning variables with regard to delinquency and substance abuse.
A study was conducted by Lee and Akers (1999) examining the social structure factors on delinquency and substance abuse from a sample of 1 725 adolescents aged between 11 and 17 obtained from the National Youth Survey. They discovered that the Social Structure and Social Learning theory has an indirect application to substance abuse and a more a direct (partial) application to delinquency. They found that delinquency was positively associated with the differential location in variables such as age, gender and social status and differential social location was positively associated with variables such as family structure and population size.

In another study by Lee, Akers and Borg (2004) on the SSSL propositions, the focus was on differential locations (gender, class and age), differential social location in primary and secondary groups (family structure) and differential social organisation (community size), including all the social learning variables. The study was conducted on substance abuse (alcohol and marijuana) amongst adolescents. They found that socio economic status, age, family structure and community size had a substantial effect on social learning variables.

Bellair, Roscigo and McNulty (2003) examined the social structure and its influences on the social learning variables, using data from 25 000 middle-school students in the USA, obtained from a central database measuring macro-level variables such as poverty, unemployment, occupation and households and micro-level variables such as race, employment, sports involvement, education, violence exposure and family mobility. They found that there was a significant influence of the social structure variables on the social learning variables, especially in adolescent violence and family processes.

Lanza-Kaduce and Capece (2003) also tested the Social Structure and Social Learning theory on university students from eight different institutions for drug and alcohol abuse. Their sample included 2 783 students aged between 17 and 23 years. They found that structural variables such as race, gender and climate were positively associated with alcohol abuse. Lanza-Kaduce, Capece and Alden (2006) also conducted another study using the SSSL framework on college students' drinking behaviour before sexual intercourse. The sample consisted 688 white single college students, aged eighteen years and older from Core Alcohol and Drug Survey
data in the United States. The findings indicated that there might be substantial effects on the social learning variables by the social structure variables.

Holland-Davis (2006) conducted a complete test of the SSSL theory using the micro and macro perspectives as illustrated above, using data from a Boys’ Town community in the United States on self-reported drug abuse cases. She found that there was a strong influence by the social structure propositions on all the social learning variables for abuse of alcohol, marijuana and other illicit drugs. The social structure variables included in the study were sex, population density, poverty, ethnicity, residential mobility and religion.

In 2008, a study conducted by Verill tested delinquent behaviour using the SSSL theoretical model, using a sample 1,674 high-school students in Florida. The study used SSSL variables such as population density, race, sex, age, family attachment, poverty, residential mobility, ethnicity and the social learning variables such as differential association, definitions and differential reinforcement for the test. His findings reflect that there was moderate evidence that the social structure variables influence the social learning variables in determining delinquency.

In another study, Gibson, Poles and Akers (2010) reviewed peer delinquency amongst children and adolescents in Chicago, using only two social structural dimensions, namely Theoretically Defined Constructs (concentrated disadvantage) and Differential Locations (age, race, gender and socio economic status), with one social learning variable (differential association). They found that the social structure variables positively influence the social learning variables for delinquency. Other researchers such as Haynie et al. (2006) and Wu et al. (2008) also support these observations.

### 3.5. The application of the Social Structure and Social Learning theory to institutional misconduct and gang membership

The literature presented supra indicates that the Social Structure and Social Learning theory has not been applied to institutional misconduct and gang membership before, but it is potentially useful for understanding this context. The application of the theory will be done in two phases; firstly, the social learning dimension will focus on individual-level (importation) variables to determine whether
inmates indeed import their behaviour from the street or whether they learn it in the correctional centre. The SLT will also determine the factors that contribute to inmates’ deviant behaviour. Secondly, the social structure dimension will focus on the social or cultural (deprivation and situational) variables of the centre to determine the extent to which these variables contribute towards inmates’ delinquent behaviour.

To determine where individuals learn their deviant behaviour, the study will use substance abuse and street gang affiliation as dependant variables to measure individuals’ deviant behaviour. Previous studies by Lee and Akers (1999) and Gibson et al. (2010) indicated that these dependant variables could significantly measure delinquent behaviour and substance abuse in the SSSL context. The dependant variables will then be measured against the individual-level characteristics identified by the importation model to determine if there is a relationship between prior incarceration and later incarceration in respect of deviant behaviour. Second, using the modes of association identified in the differential association aspect, the deviant behaviour of inmates and their association with deviant friends and family members will be measured to determine how they learned their deviant behaviour. Third, using the operant conditions identified by the differential reinforcement and definitions aspects, the reasons why inmates became deviant will be investigated. Lastly, the study will use the same dimensions discussed above to measure whether inmates becomes deviant in a correctional centre based on their associations or operant conditions.

In respect of the social and cultural dynamics identified by the deprivation and situational contextual perspectives, the study will use the Social Structure theory to determine the extent to which it applies to inmates’ deviant and delinquent behaviour. In the differential social organisation dimension, the study will use overcrowding and the characteristics of the centre (staff and control) of correctional centres to determine the impact these have on inmates’ deviant behaviour. A study conducted by Lee et al. (2004), discussed earlier, used community size as a variable and the findings were that there was a positive relationship between social learning and community size. This study further intends to initiate a new model by using the differential social location dimension to measure the socio-demographics (i.e., age,
employment, education and race) of the correctional centre population to determine
the extent to which they contribute towards inmates’ deviant behaviour. The
independent variables used in the social structure dynamic of the centre include
substance abuse, street gang membership, institutional gang membership, number
of disciplinary infringements, current offences and previous criminal history.

In concluding the study, the intention will also be to develop a prediction model
based on significant indicators towards institutional misconduct and gang
membership that will assistant the Department of Correctional Service to proactively
identify possible gang members in correctional centres.

3.6. Conclusion

From the literature and the theoretical review, it is evident that delinquency and
deviant behaviour are not based only on an individual’s characteristics but are
influenced by other factors such as the social environment, culture, subculture and
the physical structure of a particular community. Although the literature and
theoretical review referred to different types of environments, both community and
institutional, the assumption can be made that these contexts are influenced by the
same variables.

Therefore, this study explores the SSSL variables to measure the impact that social,
cultural and subcultural environments have on inmates, institutional gangs and the
administration of a correctional facility. The aim of the study is to use these variables
to explain to what extent institutional gangs control and manipulate the correctional
environment. The study intends to determine whether gang members are more
delinquent than non-gang members, and if gang members commit more institutional
misconduct and violent offences than their counterparts, the non-gang members, do.
It will also determine the role that institutional gangs play in institutional misconduct
and violence, and to what extent correctional officials is complicit in gang activities.
Chapter 4: Methodology

4.1. Introduction

In the previous chapters, the researcher outlined the purpose and objectives of the study. This chapter explains the methodological aspects (design, data collection and data analysis) of this study, providing a complete ‘map’ of the researcher’s approach to answering the research questions.

Research design refers to the goals and objectives of the study, the unit of analysis and the sampling techniques that were used. Data collection refers to the measuring instruments, interviews, questionnaires, observations and document sources (primary and secondary data) that were used. Data analysis describes the process of bringing order, structure and meaning to the collected data. These sections will be discussed in detail below.

4.2. Research design

The purpose of the research design is to indicate the process that was followed by the researcher in collecting, analysing and interpreting the data for the study. Mouton and Marais (1989:29) and Bless and Higson-Smith (1995:63) refer to design as a road map in that it guides the researcher in collecting, analysing and interpreting observed facts. Mouton (2001:49,56) postulates that research design is the section of a study that deals with the initial stages of the project to guide the researcher regarding the type of thesis that is needed to adequately answer the research question, and to deliver the end product.

4.2.1. Research aim

A basic explorative, descriptive and explanatory research approach was followed in conducting the study to provide knowledge and understanding of a relatively unknown study field within the correctional environment. The literature review revealed that empirical validity in South African studies was non-existent. Empirical evidence in this study will provide unique information and insight for the South African correctional services context. The aim of this study was to understand the
developing of inmates’ deviant behaviour and the role that the social and cultural environment plays in such deviant behaviour. Deviant behaviour here refers to institutional misconduct and gang membership.

The explorative nature of the study was directed at obtaining new insight into how and why inmates develop deviant behaviour, and the role that the social environment plays in such behaviour, especially in South Africa, where gangs have controlled correctional centres for so many years (Bless & Higson-Smith 1995:42; Mouton & Marais 1989:42). The study also intends to describe and explain how these gangs influence their members to engage in violence and institutional misconduct.

Explanation is a method used to explain behaviour and in this case to answer questions of why, where, when and how the gangs manage to do what they do (Babbie 2001:93–94; De Vos et al. 2002: 109–110; Sarantakos 1998:6–7).

4.2.2. Research objectives

De Vos, Strydom, Fouche and Delport (2002:8) state that the goals of research ‘imply the end towards which efforts or ambitions are directed’. To achieve the objectives of the study, the researcher developed various methods to uncover data. The first objective was to establish the personal and social characteristics of the inmates, prior and post incarceration, which led to their institutional misconduct, violence and gang membership. The second objective was to determine the structural and cultural dynamics within the social system of the correctional centre that exacerbated gang activities and institutional misconduct and violence.

According to De Vos and Fouche (1998:115–116) research is based on certain questions which need to be addressed. These questions aim at providing answers to the gaps that have been identified and on which the research is based. The research questions that guided this study include:

- Do inmates import their individual-level characteristics (personal, family and environmental) to the correctional centre?
- How and why do inmates engage in deviant behaviour in the correctional centres and in society?
- Why do inmates engage in institutional misconduct and gang membership?
• How does the social and cultural environment contribute to inmates’ deviant behaviour?
• What role do the correctional officials and correctional administration play in controlling inmates’ deviant behaviour?

4.3. Research method

The researcher adopted a mixed method approach that consisted of a combination of quantitative and qualitative research to gain a more complete understanding of the phenomenon. According to Leedy and Ormrod (2005:95), a quantitative research approach summarises data by means, correlations and median statistics. It aims to predict and explain the general concepts of the data that can be found at similar places. It objectively measures the variable(s) of interest and establishes their validity and reliability in respect of their identification, development and standards.

Qualitative research approaches tend to lead to a deeper and broader understanding of a specific phenomenon. The qualitative design is more flexible and less formalised than quantitative design (De Vos et al. 2005: 74–75). According to Barbie (2001:94), most qualitative studies possess elements of explanation, exploration and description.

In this study, the quantitative method was used to identify the numbers of new admissions in the respective centres, using the Admission and Release System (A&R System) of the Department of Correctional Services. The official responsible was requested to generate an admissions list for all inmates who had been admitted in the previous six months (June 2016 to November 2016). Names on the A&R System-generated list were then categorised according the variables to provide a sample for the qualitative method. The variables included gang versus non-gang membership, age, sentence and security classification.

The identified inmates were then issued with semi-structured questionnaires to complete in their own time and interviewed upon submission of their questionnaires for points of clarity. Silverman (2000:89) states that the methods used by qualitative researchers represent a general belief that they can provide a deeper understanding of social phenomena than could have been obtained by purely quantitative data.

Previous studies on the correctional environment, as noted in the literature review,
were predominately based on a quantitative approach and yet lacked a deeper understanding of the phenomenon.

4.3.1. Population and study sample

According to Saunders et al. (2007), sampling is one of the most crucial components of studies, since it involves the collection of primary data from the population. The choice of a sampling technique involves identifying a principle by which members of the population will be selected for inclusion in the sampling group. The target population for this study was inmates and officials (custodians of information) who were situated in St Albans, Cradock and East London Correctional Centres within the Eastern Cape region. Inmates’ personal characteristics and the manner in which they adapt to the social environment of the correctional centre formed the primary focus area of the study. The officials and the physical structures were utilised as support structures that exercise control over the physical and social environment.

4.3.1.1. Correctional centres

A probability sampling approach using stratified sample techniques was used to identify the sites (centres) for the study. This approach was used to ensure that the selected centres represented all categories of offenders (medium male, maximum male, youth) that are incarcerated in correctional centres. These inmates also represented the broader demographical area of the Eastern Cape. The three different centres were St Albans Correctional Centre, East London Maximum Correctional Centre and Cradock Correctional Centre.

St Albans Correctional Centre

St Albans Medium Correctional Centre serves approximately 46 courts within the Nelson Mandela Metropolitan district and other nearby towns. The centre accommodates mainly adult and juvenile medium-classified offenders. The centre has an approved inmate accommodation capacity of 1 050 but currently accommodates approximately 2 500 inmates, which is 38% more than the allowed number of inmates. The Nelson Metropolitan area is the largest city in the Eastern Cape, and is considered the eighth largest in South Africa. The metropolitan area
was also classified as one that encounters particular challenges with gang activities, which operate predominately in the northern areas amongst the coloured community.

**Cradock Correctional Centre**

Cradock Correctional Centre accommodates juvenile inmates, aged between 14 and 20 years. The centre, due to decentralisation, is one of only two correctional centres in the region that accommodate juvenile inmates. The centre is situated about 250 kilometres outside Port Elizabeth and is responsible for admitting and releasing inmates from all centres across the Eastern Cape Province. Its approved inmate accommodation capacity is 245, but it currently accommodates 299 inmates; it is about 22% overcrowded. Cradock is situated within the Chris Hani District Municipality. The municipality serves three towns, namely Cradock, Middelburg and Hofmeyr.

**East London Maximum Correctional Centre**

East London Maximum Correctional Centre serves approximately 28 correctional centres across the region. The centre, due to decentralisation, is one of only two centres that accommodate adult maximum-classified inmates. The centre is situated within the Buffalo City Metropolitan area within the Eastern Cape. It has an approved accommodation capacity of 846 but the current accommodation is 1,600; it is more than 90% overcrowded.

**4.3.1.2. Officials and infrastructure (physical)**

A non-probability sampling approach was used to select officials using a purposive sample technique. Babbie (2001:179) and Pogrebin (2003:22) suggest that non-probability sampling techniques apply to research observations conducted with case studies where the research participants are representative of purposive or judgemental sampling. According to Patton, the purposive sample technique is characterised by a deliberate effort to gain representative samples, and includes groups or typical areas in a sample (Patton 1990). Officials selected to participate in the study were selected based on their level of operations and the source documents (custodian of information) at their disposal that were needed for the study.
identified officials were selected based on the researcher’s experience and knowledge in the field.

Responsible officials who had the relevant source documents were not given questionnaires, but were asked to submit certain documents and to agree to be interviewed in order to clarify information on the documents. The officials or custodians of information included case officers, case management supervisors, unit managers, security officers, case assessment officers, case management committee members, disciplinary officials, centre coordinators, and heads of the correctional centres. Initially, 30 officials were targeted for the study, but the researcher managed to obtain the cooperation of 26. The 30 documents received back were coded and analysed and since some of the sources were incomplete, they were accordingly discarded.

4.3.1.3. **Inmates**

Effective sampling ensures that the elements selected for a sample accurately resemble the parameters of the population (Terreblance, Durreim & Painter 2006:134). A probability sampling approach was used to select inmates for the study through the clustering sample technique. Two processes were used to identify the sample population for this study; first a computer-generated list with all the admissions, and secondly the categorisation of inmates from the generated list.

In the first instance, admission lists for the previous six months (June 2016 to November 2016) were obtained from each of the three selected correctional centres. The computer-generated list by the A&R System included all admissions to the correctional centres for the designated period and therefore had to be narrowed down to include only persons admitted directly from court over the previous six months. Admissions which were excluded were names of those who had been absent from the centre temporarily due to court appearances, and transfers. The complete list of 221 new admissions, compiled from the respective lists of the centres, included 65 names from Cradock, 71 from East London, and 85 from St Albans. The inmates were then categorised according their gang status, age, sentence and security classification to ensure representatively in the sample population for this study.
The newly admitted inmates were then issued with semi-structured questionnaires to complete in their own time. Out of the 221 cases that had been identified, 151 returned their questionnaires. These persons were then interviewed to ensure that answers on questionnaires were correctly understood. The received questionnaires included Cradock, 49; East London, 51; and St Albans, 51, which, according to the study, was an equal representation of the sample population across the three centres. The response rate for the sample group was 68% of the identified sample, which provide an indication that the sample for the study was reliable. The response sample further also presented both gang and non-gang inmates, which was an indication that the sample population were not bias in their responses.

4.4. Data collection

According to Hagan (2006:10), data collection is the strategy of obtaining and analysing information. Data was obtained from two main sources, primary and secondary. According to Bless and Higson-Smith (1995:99), primary data is data collected for the particular purpose of the research, and secondary data is that generated by other investigators in connection with other research problems (Bless & Higson-Smith, 1995). The primary data for this study was obtained from semi-structured questionnaires obtained from inmates, and non-structured interviews with officials regarding source documents provided, for clarification purposes on observations in the centre. Secondary data was obtained from the literature review, electronic systems, statistics and documented sources of the Department of Correctional Services.

4.4.1. Literature review

Relevant literature was used to conduct the literature study and generate the theoretical basis for this study. The literature review provided sufficient background information to the researcher to identify and understand the dynamics of the correctional environment and to critically evaluate the contributing factors that enhance delinquency and deviant behaviour amongst inmates. The literature review also revealed that no study with the specific focus of this particular study had been conducted in the past in South Africa. The various literature sources that were used
to conduct the literature study included books, scientific journals, newspaper articles and the World Wide Web (internet).

4.4.2. A&R System

The A&R System (admission and release system) is the mainframe computer system that records information on all offenders that are admitted and released in correctional centres. The A&R System is centrally managed, and the users responsible to capture data are selected based on their administrative purposes. The information captured is highly confidential and is not easily accessible. Special permission was obtained through the research department of the Department of Correctional Services to access information on inmates.

The A&R System was used to generate a list for all new admissions from June 2016 to November 2016 for each respective centre. The lists were then scrutinised to identify those inmates who had been referred to prison directly from court (the target group) and those who had come from other centres (transfers). Once the target group was selected, detailed reports that included their gang status, age, sentence and security classification were also generated from the A&R System.

4.4.3. Questionnaires

The main method of information collection was the semi-structured questionnaires distributed to inmates in the respective centres. The semi-structured questionnaires were issued in person with each individual respondent. The respondents were allowed to complete the questionnaires in their own time, to be handed in at a later stage. Upon receiving them back, the researcher conducted an unstructured interview with the respondents to clarify the feedback on the questionnaires and to do rectification, where necessary.

The questionnaires issued were constructed in both an open-ended manner (where the participants were allowed to provide their own answers and ideas) and a closed-ended manner (where participants were given a few choices to choose from). According to Welman et al. (2005:175), a questionnaire is a set of questions on a form that is completed by the respondent in respect of a research project. The
question can be open (e.g., ‘any comments?’), or closed, with an option to respond ‘yes’ or ‘no’. Closed questions offer respondents the opportunity of selecting (according to instructions) one or more response choices from a number provided to them. The purpose of the questionnaires was to investigate and evaluate inmates' personal characteristics and perspectives on the social environment of the correctional centre.

The questionnaire consisted of seven sections, Sections A to G, which covered all the relevant information required for the study. Each section had an average of five questions that were relevant to the section. The sections comprised the following:

- Section A: Personal particulars
- Section B: Childhood and family background
- Section C: Educational background
- Section D: Socio-economic status (SES)
- Section E: Societal environmental background
- Section F: Sentence history
- Section G: Social dynamics of correctional centre

Information collected in Sections A to Section E focussed on the demographics of the social life inmates had prior to their arrest. The personal particulars, childhood life and family background information provided a social background of the participant. The educational and socio-economic status reflected the social norms and values that inmates were attached to prior to their incarceration. The criminal history of the inmates provided a detail background of the inmates' current and previous encounters with law enforcement agencies. The social life and gang (street and institutional) affiliation reflected on the inmates' sense of attachment. The last section focussed on inmates' personal views (perceptions) on institutional life.

### 4.4.4. Interviews

Alexander (2000:102), Hollin (2001:350-351) and Myer (2001:14–15, 20) posit that interviews are an effective method of gathering information to assess a particular phenomenon, such as the developmental history, social competency, self-regulation
and cognitive functioning (psychological vulnerabilities and stresses) of an individual. To understand an inmate’s behaviour as a whole, the interview is the most effective resource available to do a comprehensive assessment of the individual’s personal characteristics, his social background and his adaptation within the correctional environment. Hollin (2001:351) states that the interview is the most common assessment device available to the assessor (Hollin, 2001). Champion (2000:269–270) postulates that the purpose of an interview is to describe and explore a phenomenon. Through interviewing, detailed information and insight was obtained that explained the personal characteristics and social backgrounds of inmates, and their views on institutional life and the activities of the centres.

For the purpose of this study, the researcher conducted two sets of open-ended interviews, with newly admitted inmates and with officials who were custodians of information. The newly admitted inmates were requested to complete semi-structured questionnaire in their own time, and each one was interviewed based on the answers provided in the questionnaire for clarity purposes. In their interviews, officials were asked to clarify data on policy-related matters, statistical data and observations that were collected from the various correctional sources. The sources included the anti-gang strategy of the correctional centre, the assault register, the disciplinary infringements register, the disciplinary hearings register, overcrowding reports, the security incident register, the gang database and gang profiling.

4.4.5. Document sources and statistics

Information was also collected from document sources and statistical data gathered from various sections (custodians) in the correctional environment. The custodians, officials and managers directly responsible for the management of inmates were requested to provide relevant information for the study. McMurran and Hodge (1994:36) highlight that it is important for a researcher to access or consult the relevant information (document sources) regarding a particular phenomenon in order for the researcher to acquaint him/herself with the environment.

The documents and statistical sources that were consulted during the research included case files, institutional files, detailed reports, disciplinary offence registers, security incident registers, the anti-gang strategy and the anti-gang operational plan.
The custodians for the information worked as Head of Correctional Centre, Centre Coordinator Corrections, Case Management Committee member, Unit Manager, Case Management Supervisor, Case Officer and Security Officer.

During the collection of the relevant data, the researcher also conducted open-ended interviews with the relevant officials to ensure that source documents were correctly interpreted and understood. The data gathered during the interview was coded and analysed. The custodians and information obtained from each were as follows:

Head of Correctional Centre (HCC): The HCC in each centre, as the accounting officer of the correctional centre, was requested to provide the anti-gang strategy and the operational plan for implementation of the strategy. The details of the plan were then discussed with the HCC, in terms of implementation and the practicality of the plan. The HCC was also allowed to provide personal views regarding the strategy and the operation of the strategy.

Centre Coordinator Corrections: The CC Corrections is the operational manager who needs to ensure the implementation of the anti-gang strategy and operational plan. These officials are also responsible for monitoring and evaluating the performance of the centre in terms of disciplinary incidents, security incidents and gang operations through a database.

The Unit Manager (UM), Case Management Supervisor (CMS), and Case Officer (CO) are operational or production workers who work directly with inmates. They must ensure the implementation of the anti-gang operation plan and that gang activities are minimised at all times. They must also ensure the recording of all security incidents and gang activities in inmate’s personal case files and the reporting to relevant offices.

Case Management Committee (CMC): The CMC is responsible for the management of the institutional file of the offender in terms of development and makes recommendations for possible placements of offenders. The CMC is also responsible for ensuring that case files are up to date in respect of inmate disciplinary infringements and gang affiliations.

Security Officer (SO): The SO is responsible for the overall operation of security aspects of the correctional centre. The SO must ensure that there is a database of
gang members and that they are closely monitored in respect of their involvement. This person also keeps a register of disciplinary infringements and security incidents.

During the data collection process these custodians participated in unstructured open-ended interviews. The interview questions were guided by the source documents that were at hand. As already mentioned supra, the interviews were mostly for clarification of the documents collected or the observations made. Officials’ personal experiences and viewpoints regarding the relevant documents were considered for data analysis. The interviews in general entailed three broad objectives, namely:

- Personal particulars, job descriptions and practical knowledge of the participant;
- The contents of the document and the participant’s knowledge and experience regarding the specific operational policies and procedures; and
- The participant’s personal views and recommendations with regard to the document.

4.4.6. Observations

In analysing document sources as mentioned supra, the researcher and the relevant custodian also physically visited the places of interest to conduct observation of the topic at hand. Observation occurs within a natural environment, where the setting is not altered in any way and those individuals in the environment are not aware that they are being observed (Struwig & Stead 2001: 100). The observations were predominately conducted in the physical environment where inmates and officials are engaged in activities on a daily basis.

The areas visited during the observation period included courtyards, cells, inmate exercise areas and physical structures such as the kitchen, dining halls, hospital and shops. Visits to these areas were in order to observe how the institutional gangs operated within these environments. During these observations, open-ended interviews continued with officials to seek clarity on certain explanations given.
4.5.  Data analysis

During the analysis stage, all collected data was gathered, ordered, processed and interpreted through a systematic approach. To ensure an ordered system, the researcher adopted a thematic approach, which involved the breaking up of data into manageable themes, patterns and trends to determine the relationship between variables and themes (Mouton 2001:108). In order to achieve the objective of the study, the research problem was divided into three themes. These were then further divided into various outcomes that related to the specific theme. The themes are as follows:

- The personal and social characteristics of the inmates, prior and post incarceration, that exacerbate institutional misconduct, violence and gang membership;
- The structural and cultural dynamics within the social system of the correctional centre that exacerbate gang activities and institutional misconduct and violence; and
- Explanatory variables that predict institutional misconduct, violence and gang membership.

The personal and social characteristics of the inmates’ social dynamics were measured at two different levels, namely:

- Social dynamics: Prior incarceration
- Social dynamics: Post incarceration

The social dynamics prior incarceration measured inmates’ characteristics in three different social units, namely:

- Personal and family characteristics
- SES (socio-economic status)
- Social and family dynamics

The social dynamics post incarceration measured inmates’ characteristics in three different social units, namely:

- Present of past sentence particulars
Institutional behaviour

Institutional adaptation

The social dynamics prior to incarceration focussed on inmates’ personal characteristics and the characteristics of the community of origin. The personal and community or social characteristics included variables such as background information, geographical location, ethnicity, childhood experiences and family background. The SES (socio-economic status) investigated the employment status and educational level of inmates prior to incarceration. The study used substance abuse and street gang membership as dependant variables to measure variations in the personal and social characteristics of inmates.

Social dynamics post-incarceration looked at inmates based on their sentence particulars, institutional behaviour, institutional adaptation, perceptions and attitudes. The sentence particulars focussed on inmates’ criminal histories and current offences. Institutional behaviour and adaptation focussed on the type of behaviour the inmate had displayed during his current incarceration in respect of institutional gang affiliation, disciplinary infringements, substance abuse and experiences of inmate life. Each inmate’s perceptions and attitude were measured based on how he perceived institutional life and what attitudes he displayed towards this life. The purpose of measuring these variables was to determine the extent to which institutional dynamics influenced inmate behaviour.

The structural and cultural dynamics of the correctional centre measured the institutional control and socio- and economic demographics of the inmate population. For institutional control, the staff characteristics and centre administration were measured against the frequency of institutional misconduct, gang operations and substance abuse incidents that took place over the last six months at the centre. The control exercised over these variables determined the effectiveness of the centre. In the socio- and economic demographics, the age, education level, race and employment of the inmate population were measured as dependant variables. The independent variables were the individual characteristics of the inmates, which included; street gang affiliation, substance abuse, current offence, number of...
disciplinary infringements, previous incarcerations and institutional gang membership.

To develop a prediction model for institutional gang affiliation, the study used the Social Structure and Social Learning variables that had significant impact as a measuring tool to predict current and possible future institutional gang membership. The topic of possible future gang membership focussed on variables prior to incarceration to determine whether inmates were likely to become gang members. Eventual gang membership was considered likely when inmates were already incarcerated and whose current gang status was unknown. In both cases, the study considered the personal characteristics of the inmates and the social and cultural demographics of the centre.

4.6. Strategies of analysis

The collected data was analysed using the Statistical Package of Social Science (SPSS) version 24, where the spreadsheet’s data was entered. The research used various analytical variations to test and measure the significance of the data in respect of the outcomes and themes of the study. The interpretation and usefulness of the data was then discussed, using valid arguments (De Vos et al. 2005:336–339).

The statistical analysis in this study is presented in three stages. First, an overview is presented on the different variables in the social units, followed by the presentation of the results through a comparative analysis of the different social units, and lastly, inferential statistics are given which measured the relationships of the independent variables.

The overview includes three different presentations of data, namely frequency tables, a descriptive analysis and a factor analysis. The data presented in the frequency tables includes all categorical data sets (ordinal and nominal) that explain the frequency of each variable in relation to each social unit. The frequency tables present the results with the frequency and percentages of the sample selection. The descriptive tables present all scale data that was collected during data collection. The factor analysis table presents data that was obtained from the attitude and
perception statements that were categorised into meaningful groups to explain dynamics in the correctional environment.

In developing the prediction model, the study followed a three-dimensional approach using a logistical regression analysis method. First, inmates’ personal characteristics were measured, prior to and post incarceration, in relation to factors that contribute to institutional gang affiliation and misconduct. Second, the social and cultural dynamics of the centre that exacerbate institutional gang membership and misconduct were measured. Lastly, the SLT and SSSL were measured in respect of significant relationships and a prediction model developed for institutional gang membership.

In the final stage of the analysis, the researcher unbundled the stated themes and concepts and built an overall explanation. According to Rubin and Rubin (cited in Mouton 2006:198), this approach enables the researcher to refocus on central themes of the study. In the final data analysis, common themes were grouped together; and themes and concepts were integrated into a theory that offers an accurate, detailed and reliable interpretation of the collected data.

4.6.1. Validity and reliability

According to Bless and Higson-Smith (1995:143) after the data has been analysed and the findings have been stated on the basis of qualitative analyses, the procedure and the findings must be thoroughly and critically reviewed to identify any errors of measurement, bias and mistakes that could distort the description of the social reality under investigation. In this study, after interpreting the findings, the researcher summarised the aims of the research, compares them with the findings and drew conclusions on the achievement of the goal. According to De Vos et al. (2002:166), validity relates to the ability of the instrument to measure what it sets out to measure and also refers to the accuracy of the measuring instrument.

The extensive literature research conducted on gangs ensured that the questions that were posed to the inmates were relevant and valid to the situation. During the information search on gangs, questions that were posed to individuals in the work environment revealed that the questions were indeed relevant and elicited the appropriate responses related to the themes of this study.
4.7. Ethics and human subjects issues

The following core ethical guidelines, as suggested by Royse (1991:240–243) were fully adhered to:

- All subjects involved in the research were volunteers.
- Sufficient information about the study was provided to ensure that risks and benefits were understood.
- No volunteers were compensated for participation in the study.
- Participants were allowed to withdraw at any time if they so wished.
- All literature sources of information were acknowledged.
- All participants signed an agreement stating that participation was voluntary.
- The researcher arranged for a debriefing session for any participants who felt traumatised by the interview.

The researcher obtained ethical clearance from the University of Fort Hare (see Annexure B) and the Department of Correctional Services (see Annexure C) to conduct the study.

To ensure that ethical principles were adhered to, the researcher aligned the study with four broad principles of ethics as outlined by Fulford, Dickenson and Murray (2002) and Beauchamp and Childress (2001), namely:

- Informed consent
- Confidentiality,
- Non-maleficence and
- Beneficence

4.7.1. Informed consent

The degree of risk involved in the particular study and the maturity of the subject influence whether or not adolescents are included. Risk has to be weighed against direct benefits of participation (Terreblance, Durrheim & Painter 2008:73). The Department of Correctional Services had provided written approval for the study. The researcher at the various institutions explained the aim and the purpose of the study to all the participants, where after they were issued with the questionnaire to be completed on their own. The participants who were issued with the questionnaires
and afterwards involved in interviews were requested to sign an informed consent form before each interview.

4.7.2. Confidentiality

Because of the sensitivity of the issues to be discussed, the participants were assured of confidentiality. All the information that was used in the study were kept safe and the data forms did not indicate the name of the person from whom the information was obtained, but only the section from where the information was collected.

4.7.3. Non-maleficence and beneficence

This philosophical principle supplements the autonomy principle and requires the researcher to ensure that no harm befalls research participants as a direct or indirect consequence of the research. It also obliges the researcher to maximise the benefits that the research will afford to the participants in the research study (Terreblance, Durrheim & Painter 2008:67). Since the research was done with the approval of the Department of Correctional Services, the participation of departmental officials in the research was understood to be obligatory based on their official capacity. The identity of individual officials will, however, remain anonymous. The individual officials who formed part of the study were limited to custodians of information. The study’s primary focus was on inmates and the research participants were not exposed to any harm. The inmates who were identified as participants were informed of the purposes of the research told that they were under no obligation to participate and that their participation was free and voluntary. The identities of all inmates communicated with or whose case files were made available to the researcher remains confidential and will not be divulged to any third party. The participants in the process of data collection were briefed on the security arrangements at the centre with specific reference to the requirements set out in the legislation and regulations.
Chapter 5: Data Analysis

5.1. Introduction

This chapter presents results of data collected on institutional gangs and misconduct in selected correctional centres in the Eastern Cape. The sources of data included self-completed questionnaires by inmates, interviews, document sources and observations obtained in person and from the management officials in the selected correctional centres. Using the Statistical Package of Social Science (SPSS) 24th edition, 187 variables were measured and analysed.

Results are presented in three sections:

- Personal and social characteristics of inmates prior to and after incarceration that contribute towards delinquent and deviant behaviour;
- Structural and social dynamics that influence the personal characteristics of inmates to become deviant; and
- Explanatory variables that may predict misconduct, violence and gang membership

5.2. Personal and social characteristics of inmates, prior to and post incarceration that contribute towards institutional misconduct, violence and gang membership

The personal and social characteristics measured the inmates in two areas, namely:

- Social dynamics: Prior to incarceration
  - Personal and family characteristics; and
  - Social environment

- Social dynamics: Post incarceration
  - Current or past sentence particulars;
  - Institutional behaviour;
  - Institutional adaptation
5.2.1. Social dynamics: Prior to incarceration

The social dynamics prior to incarceration measured the personal characteristics and the social environment of the inmates. Personal characteristics focus on the inmates’ street gang affiliation and substance abuse, while social environment focuses on scholastics achievements and parental attitude towards substance abuse.

5.2.1.1. **Personal and family characteristics**

The objective of measuring the personal and family dynamics was to determine to what extent inmates’ personal and family characteristics contributed to their deviant behaviour and delinquency.

**Table 5-1: Frequency Tabulation of Social and Family Dynamics: Street Gangs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Dynamics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street gang affiliation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>53.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family gang affiliation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>82.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends as gang members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>52.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for joining gang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protection</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friends belonged to gangs</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Involvement for fun</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To make friends</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Power and respect</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial gain</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attraction to gang life style</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neighbourhood tradition</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family history of crime</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family with criminal history</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>72.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Imprisoned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>79.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5.1: Perception of Violence in the Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception of violence in the community</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>100.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violence common in community</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 5.1, seven variables examined the social and family dynamics across a sample population of 151 inmates. The variables that were measured included (a) street gang affiliation, (b) family gang affiliation, (c) friends’ gang membership, (d) reasons for joining gangs, (e) family criminal history, (f) family incarceration, and (g) perception of violence in the community in which they resided.

For street gang affiliation, inmates were asked whether they belonged to a street gang, and if ‘yes’, why. The inmates were given various options to choose from to indicate the reason(s) for joining these gangs which included ‘protection,’ ‘friends belong to these groups’, ‘for fun,’ ‘to make friends’, ‘for power and respect’, ‘to make money’, ‘attracted to gang lifestyle’ and ‘neighbourhood tradition.’ The inmates were also asked to indicate whether they had family members and friends who belonged to these street gangs. If yes, they had to indicate which family member(s) were involved, and regarding friends, how many of them were involved.

In the study sample, 53% indicated that they were affiliated with a street gang prior to arrest, 52.3% had friends who belonged to gangs, and 17.2% had family members who were involved in gangs. Inmates’ family members who had a criminal history or who had been imprisoned before amounted to 27.2% and 20.5% respectively. Reason(s) for joining gangs were reflected statistically as follows:

- Protection (31.6%)
- Friends belonged to gangs (19%)
- Involvement for fun (15.2%)
- Joined gangs to make friends (10.1%)
- Power and respect (10.1%)
- Financial gain (7.6%)
- Attraction of the gang lifestyle (3.8%)
- Neighbourhood tradition (2.5%)
The general perception on community violence was one of general acceptance by inmates; it was a common phenomenon in their communities of origin.

**Table 5-2: Frequency Tabulation on Social and Family Dynamics: Substance Abuse**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Substance abuse</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>86.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental knowledge and approval of substance abuse</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>70.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents approval of substance abuse</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>94.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Addiction</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>68.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends Addiction</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>65.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of substance abuse in the community</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>86.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 5.2, six variables examined substance abuse amongst inmates, their family and friends from a sample population of 151 inmates. The variables measured included (a) substance abuse, (b) parental knowledge and approval of their abuse, (c) family addictions, (d) friends’ addictions, and (e) their perception of illegal drugs’ availability in the community they resided in.

In substance abuse, inmates were asked whether they abused substances, and if ‘yes’, what type of substance and the length of time they had used it. Respondents
had options that varied from ‘alcohol’, ‘nicotine’, ‘dagga’, ‘methamphetamine (tik), ‘crack/mandrax’, ‘cocaïne’, ‘heroin’, ‘methadone’ to ‘tranquilizers.’ The inmates were also asked to indicate whether they had family members and friends who used substances. If yes, which family members were involved, and for friends, how many of them were involved.

In parental awareness, inmates had to indicate whether their parents were aware of their substance abuse and if yes, did they approve such abuse. Inmates’ perceptions on the availability of illegal substances in the community measured the extent to which these activities influenced or contributed towards the inmate’s substance abuse.

Regarding substance abuse, the study found that 86% of the inmates were substance abusers, and 68.9% of their family members, and 65.6% of their friends were substance abusers. The general perception on the availability of illegal substances in the community was that substances were easily accessible in most of the inmates’ communities. Regarding parental awareness of substance abuse, 26% of the inmates indicated that their parents knew about their addictions, and 3.3% said that parents approved the inmates’ substance abuse.

### Table 5-3: Cross Tabulation for Personal and Family Characteristics in Street Gang Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Variation</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Street gang affiliation</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Street gang affiliation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family gang affiliation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends gang members</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>97.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional gang member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5-4: Cross Tabulation for Personal and Family Characteristics in Substance Abuse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Variation</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Substance abuse</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Substances</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age in Categories</td>
<td>Juvenile</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Young adult</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>76.1%</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Older adult</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior citizen</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Variation</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Substance abuse</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One or more Count</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tables 5.3 and 5.4 illustrate cross tabulations between inmates' substance abuse and street gang affiliation within their social environment. In street gang affiliation, the study found 65.4% of inmates who belonged to a street gang prior to arrest had family members that belonged to street gangs, and 76.8% of the inmates who did not belong to street gangs had no family members that belonged to street gangs. The table further indicated that 55.7% of the inmates who did belong to street gangs prior to arrest had peers or friends who also belonged to street gangs, and 97.2% of the inmates who did not belong to a street gang had peers or friends who did not belong to street gangs' prior to arrest.

The study also found that 90.0% of inmates who belonged to street gangs also belonged to institutional gangs, and 28.2% of inmates who did not belong to street gangs ended up joining institutional gangs after their incarceration. For age of inmates who belonged to street gangs, the study found 76.1% of the inmates who belonged to street gangs were young adults, whereas older inmates were less likely to be gang members in this sample. The study indicated that there was significant correlation ($\chi^2 (3, N = 151) = 22.06, p= .001$) between an inmate’s street gang affiliation and their family members’ or peers/friends’ gang affiliation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional gang member</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>44</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>46</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0.24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family members substance abuse</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>47</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>47</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0.001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friends substance abuse</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>96</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>99</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0.001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For substance abuse, the study found that 100% of the inmates who used substances had family members who also used similar substances, and 19.2% of the inmates who did not use any substances had family members who did not use substances. For friends’ substance abuse, 97% of the inmates had friends who used similar substances, and 32.7% of the inmates who did not use substances had friends who did not use substances. The study also found 60.1% of the inmates who used substances had previous criminal histories, and 70.2% of the inmates who used substances were young adults. The study indicated that there was a significant correlation ($\chi^2 (3, N = 151) = 22.06, p= .001$) between inmates and their peers/friends’ and family members’ substance abuse.

5.2.1.2. The social environment

The social environment refers to the social dynamics of the society in which the inmate grew up and the various characteristics they adopted in their communities. The social dynamics used in this study include the inmate’s scholastic achievements and the relationship between the inmate and his primary care giver. The purpose was, first, to establish how many of the inmates had completed their school career and if not, why they had not completed it. Second, the purpose was to determine the primary caregiver’s role during their childhood and the type of relationship the inmate had with their caregiver.

During the data collection, inmates were asked if their parents were aware of their drug use and if they indicated yes, whether the parents approved such abuse. Inmates were asked what the highest level of schooling was that they had achieved. Those who did not complete their schooling were also asked why they had not done so. The inmates were given several options to choose from which included (1) ‘I didn’t like it/boring’; (2) ‘Expelled’; (3) ‘Friends’ (4) ‘Employment’; (5) ‘Too hard’; (6) ‘Bullied’ and (7) ‘Other.’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Variation</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Use Substance</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parental control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents know</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>about</td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Table 5.5, the responses of the parents were measured against the results for substance abuse. The study measured the level of control that was exercised by the caregiver to minimise or prevent the abuse of substances. According to the inmates, 29.8% of their parents knew about their substance abuse. While 3.8% of the parents approved the substance abuse, 3.1% approved it only occasionally, while 93.1% did not approve it at all. The study further revealed that in the case of 67.2% of the inmates who abused substances, parents were not aware of it. The study found that there was a significant correlation ($\chi^2 (2, N = 151) = 22.06, p = .001$) between substance abuse and parental approval thereof.

**Table 5-6: Cross Tabulation on School Dropouts and Reasons for Non-Completion**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>School Grade completed</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary Gr 0-7</td>
<td>Secondary Gr 8-11</td>
<td>Grade 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differential reinforcement</td>
<td>Reason for non-completion of school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn’t like it/boring</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expelled</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.6 illustrates the highest level completed by inmates during their school career and the reason for non-completion. The study found that there was a significant correlation ($\chi^2 (2, N = 151) = 22.06, p= .001$) between inmates’ dropout rate and their school completion. In school dropouts, the study found that 92% of inmates had not completed their school career; 27% left at the primary level and 64.2% at the secondary level. In respect of reason for non-completion, in 52.4% of the cases who had dropped out at the primary level and 54.5% of the cases who had dropped out at the secondary level, it was because of friends. Other reasons, such as school was boring, too hard, employment and expelled, were minimal amongst the sample population.

Data presented in Tables 5.5 and 5.6 indicates that parents did not exercise proper control and supervision over individuals who indicated that they abused substances, because 93.1% of the parents were not even aware of their substance abuse or addiction. The lack of parental control and supervision were also observed in inmates’ school dropout rates; 92% of the inmates in this sample had not completed their school career. Taken together, friends were a common denominator in several aspects of the inmates’ lives for this sample; friends were cited as reasons for joining street gangs, for substance abuse and for school dropouts. Given these facts, a logical conclusion can be made that friends play a prominent role in most of the inmates’ lives used in this sample. Inmates were mostly influenced by their friends to engage in deviant activities. The parent’s role in providing guidance and support during this stage of the individuals live was absent, indicating of a lack of parental control.
5.2.2. Social dynamics: Post incarceration

For social dynamics after incarceration, the researcher measured inmates’ sentence particulars, institutional behaviour, institutional adaptation and perceptions. Institutional behaviour and adaptation focussed on inmates’ institutional gang affiliation, disciplinary infringement and substance abuse experienced during their incarceration period. Inmates’ perceptions measured how they perceived institutional life and what the attitudes they displayed towards such a life. The purpose of measuring these variables was to determine the extent to which institutional dynamics influenced inmates’ behaviour.

5.2.2.1. Institutional behaviour and adaptation

The objective of investigating institutional behaviour and adaption was to determine whether inmates’ personal characteristics contributed towards their engagement in institutional misconduct and gangs, or whether the institutional lifestyle influenced inmates to engage in such activities. The investigation of inmates’ perceptions was based on general observations inmates made regarding institutional gang activities, control and disciplinary infringements during their period of incarceration. A four-point Likert scale was used to obtain inmates’ responses to a series of statements. Options included strongly disagree, disagree, agree and strongly agree.

Disciplinary infringements refer to the number of infringements the inmate committed while incarcerated. Inmates also had to indicate the reason(s) for the violations. The reasons were categorised according to gang’s involvement, temper and disobedience. In the reason for violation, violations were categorised as aggressive, sexual, economic, or substance infringements. Disciplinary infringements are core to this study because the literature indicates that the number of violent incidents a centre has is closely related to the prevalence of gangs in the centre.

Corrective measures for violating the code of conduct of a correctional centre vary from participation in correctional programmes, the degrading of privilege group and the upgrading of security classification. Correctional programmes are rendered to inmates to address their criminal behaviour. If an inmate commits a disciplinary infringement, correctional programmes are included as part of corrective measures.
During the process of data collection, inmates were asked whether they attended any correctional programmes. If they answered ‘yes,’ they were asked to indicate which programmes. These programmes were categorised as follows: anger management programmes, which are for inmates involved in violent crimes; substance abuse programmes, which are for inmates who abuse substances; sexual abuse programmes, for inmates who had sexually orientated infringements; and life skills programmes, designed for inmates who committed economic crimes, such as theft, house breaking and robbery.

Security classifications and privilege groups are security classification tools that assist the Department of Correctional Services to measure inmates’ levels of risk. The risk that an inmate poses is calculated by a point system that allocates points to a particular risk factor. The security classifications are minimum, medium and maximum security risk. Minimum-classified inmates are low-risk inmates, meaning that they do not pose a serious threat to society, but if the risk increases due to an additional sentence for the violation of the code of conduct, such an inmate’s security classification might increase to the next level. Maximum-classified inmates are high-risk inmates, meaning that they pose a serious threat to the community and to the institution itself. Measuring these variables may potentially assist in determining inmates’ attitude and their levels of involvement in institutional misconduct and violence.

Regarding institutional gang affiliation, inmates had to indicate whether they belonged to an institutional gang or not. Whether yes or no, they were asked to provide a reason(s) for their involvement or lack thereof. The categorical reasons in respect of an affirmative answer were:

- Protection
- Power and respect
- Friends belong to these gangs
- They enjoy the gang life
- To make new friends
- Tradition, or
- For financial gain
In the case of a ‘no’ answer, options were; they do not like gangs, they are not interested, they are ambitious or they want to finish their sentence.

Table 5-7: Frequency Tabulation on Disciplinary Infringements and Corrective Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary infringements</td>
<td>Number of infringements per inmate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary infringement categories</td>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>56.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sexual</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Substance</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for violation</td>
<td>Gangsterism</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>71.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Temper</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disobedience</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional programmes</td>
<td>Number of inmates attended programmes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of Programmes attended</td>
<td>Substance</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sexual</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Life skills</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Classification</td>
<td>Security class</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privilege groups</td>
<td>B Group</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Group</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 5.7, seven variables examined institutional misbehaviour and interventions that inmates were subject to across a sample population of 151. The variables included (a) the number of infringements, (b) the category of infringements, (c)
reason(s) for engaging in infringements, (d) correctional programmes attended, (e) the type of programme attended, (f) security classification, and (g) privilege groups.

In disciplinary infringements, the study found that 64.2% of the inmates had one or more disciplinary infringements, which varied from one to a maximum of four per inmate. The disciplinary infringement categories indicated that 56.7% of the inmates had aggressive infringements, 7.3% had sexual infringements, 20.5% were substance related, and 0.7% were economic related. Reasons for engaging in violations were gang involvement at 71.1%, loss of temper at 22.1% and disobedience at 14.3%.

With regard to correctional programmes, the study indicated that 11.3% attended substance abuse programmes, 26.5% anger management programmes, 11.9% sexual abuse programme and 9.9% life skills programmes. Regarding security classification, 67.5% inmates were maximum-classified inmates and 32.5% were medium classification. More than half of the inmates enjoyed B-group privileges (51.7%), followed by 47.7% with A-group privileges. Only one inmate had a C-group classification.

Table 5-8: Frequency Tabulation on Institutional Gang Affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional gang membership</td>
<td>Gang affiliation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type of gang</td>
<td>26 gang</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28 Gang</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reason(s) for joining</td>
<td>Protection</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>For power and respect</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Friends belongs</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Like gang life</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To make new friends</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tradition</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Financial gain</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Table 5.8, four variables examined the institutional gang membership of inmates across a sample population of 151 inmates. The variables included: (a) gang affiliation, (b) type of gang, (c) reason(s) for joining, and (d) reason(s) for not joining institutional gangs.

Regarding institutional gang affiliation, the study found that 60.9% belonged to institutional gangs, compared to 39.1% who did not belong to such gangs. From the 60.9% who did belong to institutional gangs, 59.8% of them belonged to the 26 gang and 40.2% belonged to the 28 gang. There was no indication of membership of the Big 5, Airforce 23 or 24, and the 27 gangs in this sample. The reason(s) provide as to why they joined these gangs included:

- Protection (47.8%)
- Power and respect (16.3%)
- Friends were gang members (13%)
- Like the gang life style (9.8%)
- Want to make new friends (6.5%)
- Financial gain (3.3%)

Table 5-9: Cross Tabulation for Institutional Behavioural Dynamics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Centre of detention</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cradock</td>
<td>EL Max</td>
<td>St Albans</td>
<td>Max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary infringement of inmates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No infringements</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or more infringements</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>85.8%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional gang membership for inmates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.9 illustrates a comparison between correctional centres in respect of disciplinary infringements, institutional gang membership and substance abuse in each centre. The intention was to determine the frequencies with which these incidents happened at the respective centres.

With regard to disciplinary infringements, the study indicated that 85.8% inmates at Cradock Correctional Centre had one or more disciplinary infringements; 72.2% belonged to institutional gangs, and 97.6% abused substances. At St Albans Correctional Centre, 72.2% of the inmates had one or more disciplinary infringements; 41.8% belonged to institutional gangs, and 74.9% abused substances. At East London Correctional Centre, 35.4% of inmates had one or more disciplinary infringements; 66.0% belonged to institutional gangs, and 88.4% abused substances.

The study also revealed that 69.5% of the inmates at Cradock did not belong to any gang prior to their arrest, but after incarceration, this figure had reduced to 39.1%. In St Albans 52.9% of the inmates did not belonged to any gang prior to arrest, but after incarceration this figure had reduced to 33%. In East London 64.7% of the inmates...
did not belong to any gang prior to arrest but after arrest, this figure had decreased to 58.2%. Evidently, at centres where institutional gang activities were prominent, inmates eventually join these gangs.

The study indicated that there was a significant correlation ($\chi^2 (3, N = 151) = 22.06, p=.001$) between the different centres regarding disciplinary infringements, substance abuse, street gang affiliation and institutional gang affiliation. The study revealed that if disciplinary infringements and institutional gangs are common features in a correctional centre, inmates tend to develop a positive perception towards such activities and therefore engage in such activities.

**Table 5-10: Cross Tabulation: Security Risk Indicators per Correctional Centre**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Centre of detention</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cradock</td>
<td>EL Max</td>
<td>St Albans Max</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcrowding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcrowding</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
<td>67.14%</td>
<td>17.29%</td>
<td>39.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Population</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>1414</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>3131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved accommodation</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>1151</td>
<td>2242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of assaults reported</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAPS cases opened</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
<td>81.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases finalized</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>78.2%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Disciplinary hearings conducted</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case finalized</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>91.2%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>85.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case outstanding</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gang data base for inmates vs. population</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>1414</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>3131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 5.10 illustrates a comparison between the selected correctional centres and their control measures that were instituted to manage disciplinary infringements, assaults, institutional gang membership and substance abuse. The management strategies included disciplinary hearings in the previous six months (July to December 2016), assault investigations in the last six months (July to December 2016) and degrading of security classifications.

With regard to overcrowding, the study found East London Correctional Centre was 67.1% overcrowded, followed by Cradock Correctional Centre at 49.5% overcrowded and St Albans at 17.3% overcrowded. The overcrowding of the centres was calculated by using the actual lock-up figure for the last day of the month (November 2016) in the following formula:

\[
\text{Overcrowding} = \left( \frac{\text{Actual lock up}}{\text{Approved accommodation}} \times 100 \right) - 100
\]

In Cradock, the study found that 37.5% of assault cases were reported to SAPS, of which only 12.3% of cases were finalised. Finalised refers to the entire process being completed, where investigations are conducted and corrective measures taken against perpetrators. The number of disciplinary hearings finalised in the previous six
months (July 2016 to December 2016) was 0%. The inmates’ security classifications indicated that 100% of the inmates were in the medium-classified group and 71.4% enjoyed A-group privileges. The study also indicated that the centre did not have a gang database for inmates who belonged to gangs in their centre.

In St Albans, the study found 79.7% assault cases were reported to SAPS of which only 24.6% cases were finalised. For disciplinary hearings finalised in the previous six months (July 2016 to December 2016), 11 cases were reported, of which 54.5% were finalised. The inmates’ security classifications indicated that 100% of the inmates in the centre were maximum-classified inmates and 13.7% enjoyed A-group privileges. The study also indicated that the centre did not have a gang database for inmates that belonged to gangs in their centre.

In East London, the study found 100% of assault cases were reported to SAPS and 78.2% cases were finalised. In disciplinary hearings finalised for the previous six months (July 2016 to December 2016), 57 cases were reported of which 91.2% were finalised. The inmates’ security classifications indicated 100% were maximum-classified inmates and 58.8% enjoyed A-group privileges. The centre did have a gang database for inmates who belonged to institutional gangs but only 29% of the total population reflected on the database.

Data presented in Tables 5.9 and 5.10 indicate that 97 cases (64.2%) of the sample (total population) had committed one or more disciplinary infringements during their incarceration. Cradock Correctional Centre had 42 cases (85.8%) of the inmates who had committed one or more infringements during their incarceration period, followed by St Albans with 37 cases (72.5%), and East London with 18 cases (35.3%). See Table 5.8.

In disciplinary hearings conducted and number of assault cases finalised in the previous six months by the respective centres, the study found that a total of 68 disciplinary hearings had been conducted, of which 83.8% were done at East London Correctional Centre, followed by 16.2% at St Albans, and none at Cradock. The number of assaults reported was 191 in the previous six months, with 29.8% of
these cases finalised. The centre that finalised the most assaults was East London with 78.2%, followed by St Albans with 24.6% and Cradock with 12.3%. See Table 5.9.

When comparing the number of self-reported infringements with the number of disciplinary hearings conducted at the respective centres, it was obvious that the centres (Cradock and St Albans) that did not effectively utilise disciplinary infringements as a control measure to reinforce discipline had higher numbers of infringements and assaults. The failure of the mentioned centres resulted in an increase of incidents (disciplinary infringements and assaults), because the inmates did not observe any definitions unfavourable to such behaviour. Inmates did not observe any corrective measures instituted against those that violated the code of conduct of the centre, and therefore deviant behaviour became a common phenomenon at these centres.

5.2.2.2. Inmates’ perceptions of institutional dynamics

The objective of establishing inmates’ perceptions towards institutional dynamics was to determine why inmates react differently when confronted with similar scenarios in correctional centres, and how they perceive institutional life. Using a four-point Likert scale model, inmates were provided with a list of statements and were asked to choose whether they strongly disagree, disagree, agree or strongly agree.

Table 5-11: Factor Analysis: Inmates’ Perceptions of Institutional Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Officials can’t control the gang activities (10)</td>
<td>.779</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being a gang member makes life easy in prison (7)</td>
<td>.641</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gangs provide more protection than officials (9)</td>
<td>.638</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some of the correctional officials are part of the gangs (4)</td>
<td>.564</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being a gang member gives you more benefits than not being one (2)</td>
<td>.499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmates listen more to gangs than officials in a prison (8)</td>
<td>.463</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New inmates entering the correctional centres are forced to join gangs (6)</td>
<td>.587</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence is part of Institutional life (1)</td>
<td>.578</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.11 illustrates a factor analysis for inmates’ perceptions of the institutional environment. In the factor analysis, the factorability of twenty statements was examined and several well-recognised criteria for factorability of a correlation were found. The most appropriate and sensible factorability provided four main categorical factor groups, which suited the interests of this study. In the factor analysis, only 18 out of the 20 indicators correlated with at least four items, which suggests reasonable factorability. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was .633, above the commonly recommended value of .6, and Bartlett’s test of sphericity was significant, ($\chi^2 (1, N = 151) = 957.088, p = .001$). Given these overall indicators, factor analysis was deemed suitable with 18 out of the 20 indicators; two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gangs have more power than the officials in the correctional centre (3)</td>
<td>.576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non gang members are less privileged than gang members (18)</td>
<td>.563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gang members are responsible for most assaults in the centre (14)</td>
<td>.541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidents of assaults are not always reported and recorded in the centre (15)</td>
<td>.510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contraband are easily accessible in the centre (16)</td>
<td>.504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assaults are common in correctional centre (member on inmate (11)</td>
<td>.811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assaults are common in correctional centre (inmates on member) (12)</td>
<td>.747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assaults are common in correctional centre (inmates on inmate) (13)</td>
<td>.596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officials ensure that gang activities are not tolerated in the centre (20)</td>
<td>.764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The officials ensure that inmates are expose to the minimum risk possible (19)</td>
<td>.754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eigen value</strong></td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variance</strong></td>
<td>15.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reliability</strong></td>
<td>.707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor mean</strong></td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor standard deviation</strong></td>
<td>.558</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rotation converged in 14 iterations.
indicators (5 and 17) did not match any of the four categorical factors and were removed from the analysis.

The categorical factors were then grouped and renamed as ‘perception of progressiveness of gangs’ (factor 1), ‘perception of gang supremacy’ (factor 2), ‘perception of institutional assaults’ (factor 3), and ‘perception of level of institutional control that is exercised’ (factor 4).

Perception of gang progressiveness provided an interpretation of how inmates perceived gangs and the benefits that these gangs confer on them, in their opinion. Perception also included the role that the officials and administration of the centres played in controlling gangs. Inmates see institutional gangs as a means to a successful institutional life because they can provide what the officials and administration lack, i.e., security. The perception of gang supremacy provided insight on the extent to which institutional gangs control the inmates and administration of the correctional centre. It reflects on the threat gangs pose to vulnerable inmates and how gangs manipulate the operations (legal and illegal) in the centres. The perception on institutional assaults provided insights into how inmates interpreted assaults between inmates and officials in the centre. The perception on institutional control provided insight into attempts by the administration to control inmates.

The study used principal components analysis to identify and compute composite scores for the factors underlying the short version of the perceptions. The Eigen values indicated that the first six factors had an Eigen value above one but only four were utilised, which were 4.07, 2.61, 1.86 and 1.67. The fifth and sixth factors did not correlate with the objective of the study. The variances in respect of factorability for the indicators were 15.44%, 13.79%, 11.12% and 10.75%. The factor analysis also appeared to be reliable since all reliability indicators were between the .600 and .800 deviations; for factor 1, the reliability was .707, for factor 2, .658, for factor 3, .678, and for factor 4, .699.

To analyse the perceptions of inmates the study used a one-way analysis of variance test to measure inmates’ perceptions on institutional life. The study conducted four separate tests. The first was to compare the perception of inmates
across centres and the other three compared the perceptions based on their institutional gang affiliations, substance abuse and disciplinary infringements.

Table 5-12: One-Way Anova: Analysis Of Variance: Inmates Perceptions across Centres

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre of detention</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perception of inmates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception on the gang progressiveness</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.6156</td>
<td>.50599</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cradock</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2.2026</td>
<td>.52948</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Albans Max</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5915</td>
<td>.54804</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>2.4680</td>
<td>.55834</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception on the gang supremacy</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.4111</td>
<td>.58513</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cradock</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2.2829</td>
<td>.42039</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Albans Max</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5910</td>
<td>.43894</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>2.4286</td>
<td>.49898</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of institutional assault</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.5510</td>
<td>.72640</td>
<td>0.826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cradock</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2.5556</td>
<td>.67550</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Albans Max</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6275</td>
<td>.64858</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>2.5784</td>
<td>.69250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of institutional control</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>.72887</td>
<td>0.496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cradock</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.0392</td>
<td>.66214</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Albans Max</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.8824</td>
<td>.68984</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>2.9735</td>
<td>.69231</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 5.12, four variables provide an analysis of variance on inmates’ perceptions of the three different correctional centres across a sample population of 151 inmates. The data showed an equal distribution of inmates over the respective centres. A comparative analysis between the mean and standard deviations for each centre was conducted across centres. The perceptions included (a) perception of gang progressiveness, (b) perception of gang supremacy, (c) perception of institutional assaults and (d) perception of institutional control.

On the perception of gang progressiveness, Cradock’s were: mean 2.62, standard deviation .506; East London’s scores were: mean 2.20, standard deviation .529 and St Albans Maximum’s scores were mean 2.59, standard deviation .548. The standard deviations in all three categories were minimal, which indicates that most of the inmates had more or less the same opinion on the benefits of gang membership. Analysis shows that the perceptions of gang progressiveness in the various
correctional centres were significantly different ($\chi^2 (2, N = 151) = 9.738, p = .001$). From the analysis, it may be concluded that inmates incarcerated at Cradock and St Albans had a stronger perception on the progressiveness of gangs than in East London. When compared with previous findings discussed supra, it becomes evident that the reason for a more favourable perception on gang progressiveness at the Cradock and St Albans centres is based on the fact the gang activities are more prevalent there.

On the perception of gang supremacy, Cradock’s scores were: mean 2.41, standard deviation .585; East London’s were mean 2.28, standard deviation .420; and St Albans Maximum’s were mean 2.59, standard deviation: .439. The standard deviations in all three categories were minimal, which indicates that most inmates had similar perceptions on the power of gangs. The perception of gang supremacy was found to be significantly different ($\chi^2 (2, N = 151) = 5.180, p = .007$) in the three correctional centres. From the analysis, as with perceptions on gang progressiveness, inmates at Cradock and St Albans had a stronger perception of gang supremacy than those in East London. The reason for a more favourable perception of gang supremacy at Cradock and St Albans is based on the fact that gang activities are more prevalent there.

On the perception of institutional assaults, Cradock’s scores were: mean 2.55, standard deviation: .762; East London’s were mean 2.55, standard deviation .675 and St Albans’ were mean 2.63, standard deviation .648. The standard deviation appeared quite high in all three categories, which indicates that inmates had mixed perceptions on this variable. The mean score appeared to be between ‘disagree’ and ‘agree’, with a more positive curve towards agreement when it came to institutional assaults. The perceptions of institutional assaults were found not to be significantly different ($\chi^2 (2, N = 151) = 0.192, p = .826$) in the three correctional centres. From the analysis, it may be concluded that there was no consistent support for the incidence of assaults in correctional centre. Inmates agreed that institutional assaults are a common phenomenon in all correctional centres.

On the perception of institutional control, Cradock’s scores were: mean 3.00, standard deviation .728; East London’s were mean 3.03, standard deviation: .662 and St Albans’ were mean 2.88, standard deviation: .689. The standard deviation
appeared high in all three categories, which indicates that inmates had mixed perceptions on this variable. The mean score appeared to fall between ‘agree’ and ‘strongly agree’ with a more positive curve towards strong agreement for institutional control. Perceptions of institutional control by officials were found not to be significantly different ($\chi^2 (2, N = 151) = 0.705, p = .494$) in the correctional centres. From the analysis, it may be concluded that inmates did not agree that officials are capable of exercising control over the correctional centres. The analysis further highlights that the centre that had the least gang activities, i.e., East London, displayed a stronger sentiment of agreement for this variable, whereas centres that reflected high volumes of gang activities did not agree.

*Table 5-13: Independent Sample Test: Inmates’ Perceptions and Institutional Gangs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional gang member</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perception on the gang progressiveness</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>2.5634</td>
<td>.50204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception on the gang supremacy</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2.3192</td>
<td>.61142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of institutional assault</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>2.4627</td>
<td>.50977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of institutional control</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2.3753</td>
<td>.48110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 5.13, four variables provide an independent sample test analysis on inmates’ perceptions of institutional gangs across a sample population of 151. The question tested the perceptions of inmates who belonged to institutional gangs against that of non-gang members. The sample indicated that 92 inmates belonged to institutional gangs while 59 did not. The variables included (a) perception of gang progressiveness, (b) perception of gang supremacy, (c) perception of institutional assaults, and (d) perception of institutional control.

With regard to perceptions of gang progressiveness, the mean for gang members was 2.56 and for non-gang members, 2.32. The standard deviation was .502 for gang members and .611 for non-gang members, which indicates that the sample group did not differ much in their opinions. The study found that there were significantly different ($\chi^2 (1, N = 151) = 7.158, p = .008$) perceptions on the
progressiveness of institutional gangs between gang members and non-gang members. Inmates who belonged to gangs had a stronger perception of the progressiveness of gangs than those who did not. These results are relatively obvious; gang members are likely to have a stronger feeling towards the progressiveness of their gangs than those who do not belong to gangs. The obvious reason is that they experience benefits to membership; their definitions of gangs are already favourable when they join.

On perceptions of gang supremacy amongst gang and non-gang inmates, the study found that both groups equally recognised the extent of gangs’ power. The study found that there was no significant difference ($\chi^2 (1, N = 151) = 1.104, p = .295$) between gang members and non-gang members in respect of perceptions of the supremacy of gangs in correctional centres. The mean was 2.46 for gang members and 2.38 for non-gang members, which indicates that both groups agreed that gangs wield power in correctional centres.

On perceptions of institutional assaults amongst gang and non-gang inmates, the study found that both groups equally recognised the frequency of assault incidents in correctional centres. The study found that there was no significant difference ($\chi^2 (1, N = 151) = 0.137, p = .711$) between gang members and non-gang members in respect of occurrences of assault incidents in correctional centres. The mean was 2.56 for gang members and 2.60 non-gang members, which indicates that both groups agreed that assault incidents are a common phenomenon in correctional centres.

With regard to institutional control, the study found that the mean for gang members was 2.88 and for non-gang members it was 3.11. The standard deviation was .699 for gang members and .663 for non-gang members, which indicates that the sample group did not differ much in respect of opinion. The study found that there was a significant difference ($\chi^2 (1, N = 151) = 3.845, p = .049$) of opinions between gang members and non-gang members with regard to the control exercised by officials over gang activities. Inmates who did not join gangs had a stronger perception that officials could protect them from gangs. The results presented above indicate that both parties agreed that the administration exercised sufficient control over the correctional environment to suppress gang operations.
In summary, when comparing the centres with each other, it was evident that the centres (Cradock and St Albans) that indicated that gang activities and institutional misconduct were common features had similar perceptions of institutional gangs. From the data, it was evident that inmates’ perceptions were influenced by definitions favourable to them. Inmates incarcerated in Cradock and St Albans viewed institutional gangs as progressive and supreme because the centres reflected that gangs were a prevalent and dominant feature.

In the second set of data, inmates’ perceptions were tested in respect of institutional gang affiliations, substance abuse and institutional infringements. The study found no significant differences in inmates’ perceptions and their substance abuse or disciplinary infringements. However, a significant difference was found in institutional gang affiliations. The categories that indicated a significant difference were gang progressiveness and institutional gang affiliations. The logical assumption would be that inmates who belonged to gangs would have a favourable opinion of institutional gangs, whereas non-gang members would not share that opinion. It can also be assumed that these perceptions would be higher at centres where these phenomena are more visible, compared to the centres where they are not visible.

5.3. Structural and cultural dynamics within the social system of the correctional centre that contribute towards gang activities and institutional misconduct/ violence

According to Akers (1998:331), variations in the social structure (culture and social dynamics) explain variations in crime rates, principally through their influences on the individual’s behaviour. In the correctional centres, social structure was not measured against crimes rate, but rather against the number of assaults, disciplinary infringements and prevalence of gangs at the respective centres, and the control measures implemented to minimise these aspects.

5.3.1. Institutional control

For institutional control, social and cultural characteristics of the centres were measured and compared with the frequency or volume of institutional misconduct, gang operations and substance abuse that had taken place over the previous six
months at the centre. The control exercised over the above-mentioned variables determined the effectiveness of the centre.

Table 5-14: Institutional Control of Security Incidents versus Self-Reported Incidents of Inmates

In Table 5.14, nine variables examined the performance of the centres in respect of corrective measures implemented against inmates that violated the code of conduct across a sample population of 151 inmates. The corrective measures include disciplinary hearings and investigations on assaults by DCS and SAPS, whereas transgressions referred to gang affiliation, substance abuse and disciplinary infringements. The implications and management of overcrowding were also considered.

The data presented in the above table is similar to that presented in Tables 5.8 and 5.9. Although the data is similar, the context was different. In the first set of data, the focus was on the impact of the social environment on individual behaviour; in this section, the focus was on institutional dynamics across the different centres. To summarise the data presented, the study indicated that 97 cases (64.2%) of the sample (total population) had committed one or more disciplinary infringements during their incarceration. Cradock Correctional Centre had 42 cases (85.8%) of
inmates who had committed one or more infringements during their incarceration period, followed by St Albans Maximum with 37 cases (72.5%) and East London with 18 cases (35.3%). See Table 5.8.

For disciplinary hearings conducted and number of assault cases finalised in the previous six months by the respective centres, the study found that a total of 68 disciplinary hearings had been conducted, of which 83.8% were done at East London Correctional Centre, followed by 16.2% at St Albans, and none at Cradock. The number of assaults reported was 191 in the previous six months; 29.8% of these cases were finalised. The centre that finalised the most assaults was East London with 78.2%, followed by St Albans with 24.6% and Cradock with 12.3%. See Table 5.9.

With regard to institutional control, St Albans and Cradock Correctional Centres indicated low percentages in respect of disciplinary hearings given the high number of self-reported infringements and assaults they had experienced at their centres. The inability of the management of correctional centres to ensure social controls relates to Shaw and McKay's Social Disorganisation theory, which states that disruptions in the social control of a community account for variations in crime (Kornhauser1978:120). Data presented supra clearly indicates that Cradock and St Albans Correctional Centres could or did not exercise sufficient control measures over the social environment of their centres, which resulted in their high numbers of assaults and disciplinary infringements. East London Correctional Centre, on the other hand, implemented sufficient control measures that resulted in fewer incidents at the centre. Taken together, the data reveals that disciplinary hearings, reporting of assaults and having a gang database can be effective measuring tools to determine the social and structural environment of a correctional centre.

5.3.2. Social and cultural characteristics of the centre

The social and economic demographic variables of a community can have a direct impact on individual deviant behaviour (Akers 1998). These demographic variables include race, age and socio economic status (SES). Since this study focussed on a correctional centre environment, the demographic variables were limited to age, education level, race and employment as dependant variables. The individual
behavioural characteristics were street gang affiliation, substance abuse, current offence, disciplinary infringements, previous incarcerations and institutional gang membership as independent variables.

Table 5-15: Cross Tabulation on the Differential Social Locations: Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Juvenile</th>
<th>Young Adults</th>
<th>Older Adults</th>
<th>Senior Citizen</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use Substance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>86.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prior street gang membership</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Offence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Disciplinary infringements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No infringement</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or more infringements</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Table 5.15, the inmate’s age as a social demographic variable was measured against individual characteristics, which included substance abuse, street gang affiliation, current and previous criminal history, disciplinary infringements and institutional gang affiliation. The purpose of the measurement was to determine to what extent the social demographic characteristic (age) influenced the individual behaviour of the inmate.

For substance abuse, it was found that younger age groups – juveniles (100.0%), and young adults (88.5%) – were more likely to engage in the abuse of substances than older inmates (70%) were and senior citizens (0%). The study found that there was a significant correlation ($\chi^2 (3, N = 151) = 22.06, p = .001$) between the age groups of the inmates and their substance abuse. The results indicated that younger inmates tend to be more active in substance abuse than older inmates.

For street gang affiliation, it was found that younger age groups – juvenile (80.0%), and young adults (54.8%) – were more likely to engage in street gang affiliations than older adults (15.0%) were and senior citizens (0%). The study found that there was a significant correlation ($\chi^2 (3, N = 151) = 21.301, p = .001$) between the age groups of the inmates and their street gang membership. Older adults and senior citizens are less likely to engage in street gang affiliations prior to arrest.
For disciplinary infringements, the study found that younger age groups – juvenile (68.0%) and young adults (70.2%) – were more likely to have engaged in one or more disciplinary infringements than older adults (30.0%) and senior citizens (50.0%). The study found that there was a significant correlation ($\chi^2 (3, N = 151) = 9.720, p = .023$) between the age group of inmates and the number of their disciplinary infringements. Older adults and senior citizens were less likely to engage in disciplinary infringements than younger inmates, while incarcerated.

For institutional gang affiliation, the study found that younger age groups – juvenile (72.0%), and young adults (66.3%) – were more likely to belong to institutional gangs than older adults (20.0%) and senior citizens (50.0%). The 50.0% in senior citizens was because only two inmates fit this description, and one belonged to an institutional gang. The study found that there was a significant correlation ($\chi^2 (3, N = 151) = 16.73, p = .001$) between the age group of inmates and membership of institutional gangs. Older adults and senior citizens were less likely to belong to institutional gangs while incarcerated.

For current offence and previous convictions, the study found that there was an equal distribution amongst the various age groups for the different categories and these variables. The study found that there was no significant correlation between the age group of inmates and current and previous criminal history.

In summary, when comparing age as a socio demographic indicator with individual-level factors, the data indicates that there was a significant correlation in the age of the inmates and their substance abuse, street gang affiliation, disciplinary infringements and institutional gang affiliation. Juvenile and young adult inmates appeared to be more prominent in the use of substances, affiliation to gangs (street and institutional) and tended to commit more disciplinary infringements than senior citizens and older adults. The logical inference from this is that younger inmates are more delinquent and deviant but as they grow older this type of behaviour becomes less frequent.
### Table 5-16: Cross Tabulation on the Differential Social Locations: Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Caucasian</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Coloured</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Structure: Differential Social Location</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior street gang membership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use Substance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>87.1%</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
<td>86.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current crime</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Disciplinary infringements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No infringement</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or more infringements</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No of Previous convictions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Offences</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or more previous offences</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Table 5.16, the inmate's ethnicity or race as a social demographic factor was measured against the various individual characteristics, which included substance use, street gang affiliation, current and previous criminal history, disciplinary infringements and institutional gang affiliation. The purpose of the measurement was to determine to what extent the social demographic characteristic (ethnicity) influenced the individual behaviour of inmates.

In ethnicity, the study found that coloured inmates (50.0%) were more likely to commit violent crimes (murder) than Blacks were (30.6%), whereas rape was more prominent amongst Blacks (41.1%) than amongst Coloureds (23.1%). Other crimes, such as theft and robbery, were mostly equally distributed amongst the ethnic groups. During data collection, the sample provided only one Caucasian inmate for the study. The study found that there was a significant correlation ($\chi^2 (6, N = 151) = 22.27, p = .001$) between the ethnicity of inmates and their current offence. It appears that coloured inmates are more violent than black inmates are in a correctional centre.

For the rest of the variables in the table, the study found no significant difference between race and ethnicity and substance abuse, street gang affiliation, disciplinary infringements, previous convictions and institutional gang affiliation. The study found that that these variables were mostly equally distributed amongst the different ethnic groups used in this sample.

In summary, when comparing ethnicity as a socio demographic indicator with individual-level factors, it was found that only the current crime was significantly different in respect of the ethnicity of inmates. Coloured inmates were more likely to
commit violent crimes (murder) than Blacks, and rape was more prominent amongst Blacks than amongst Coloureds. Other crimes, such as theft and robbery, were mostly equally distributed amongst the ethnic groups. During data collection, the sample provided only one Caucasian inmate for the study.

**Table 5-17: Cross Tabulation on the Differential Social Locations: Employment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Employed prior incarceration</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prior street gang membership</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use Substance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>85.1%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
<td>0.408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current crime</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>0.337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Disciplinary infringements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No infringement</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or more infringements</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Table 5.17, inmates' employment status as a social demographic factor was measured against the various individual characteristics, which included substance use, street gang affiliation, current and previous criminal history, disciplinary infringements and institutional gang affiliation. The purpose of the measurement was to determine to what extent the social demographic characteristic (employment) influenced the individual behaviour of inmates.

For street gang affiliation, the study found that 68.0% of the inmates who belonged to street gangs were unemployed prior to arrest against 45.5% who were employed. Slightly over half of all inmates who did not belong to street gangs were employed prior to arrest (54.5%), whereas 32.0% had been unemployed. The study found that there was a significant correlation ($\chi^2 (1, N = 151) = 6.770, p = .009$) between inmates’ street gang membership and their employment status prior to arrest. Inmates who had street gang membership prior to arrest were more likely to be unemployed.

For disciplinary infringements, the study found that inmates that were employed prior to arrest 56.4% of them had one or more disciplinary infringements and 43.6% had no infringements, whereas inmates who were unemployed prior their arrest 80.0% had one or more infringements and 20% had no infringements. The study found that there was a significant correlation ($\chi^2 (1, N = 151) = 10.806, p = .004$) between inmate employment status and the number of their disciplinary infringements.
Inmates who were unemployed prior to arrest were more likely to engage in disciplinary infringements.

For institutional gang affiliation, the study found that inmates that were employed prior arrest 46.5% of them did not belong to institutional gangs and 53.5% did belong to institutional gangs, whereas inmates that who were unemployed prior their arrest 76.0% of them did belong institutional gangs and 24% did not. The study found that there was a significant correlation ($\chi^2 (1, N = 151) = 7.134, p = .008$) between institutional gang membership and employment status. Inmates who were unemployed prior to arrest were more likely to join institutional gangs.

For substance abuse, current offence and previous convictions, the study found that employment status was mostly equally distributed. The study found that there was no significant correlation ($\chi^2 (1, N = 151) = .685, p = .408$) between employment status and the mentioned variables.

In summary, when comparing employment status as a socio-demographic indicator with individual-level factors, the data shows that street gang affiliation, number of disciplinary infringements and institutional gang affiliation were significantly different in relation to employment status of inmates. Current crime and previous convictions appeared not to be significant differentials for employment status of inmates. Inmates employed prior to arrest appeared to be less likely to be involved in street gang affiliation, institutional misconduct and institutional gang affiliation than their counterparts who had been unemployed prior to their arrest. The study also found that the type of crime committed and the number of prior incarcerations appeared to be common for both previously employed and unemployed inmates.

**Table 5.18: Cross Tabulation on the Differential Social Locations: School Dropouts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>School grade completed</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gr 0-7</td>
<td>(Gr 8-11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Structure: Differential Social Location</td>
<td>Prior street gang membership</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Use Substance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Current crime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Number of Disciplinary infringements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No infringement</th>
<th>One or more infringements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## No of Previous convictions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Offences</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Institutional gang member

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Table 5.18, inmates’ education status as a social demographic factor was measured against the various individual-level characteristics, which included substance use, street gang affiliation, current and previous criminal history, disciplinary infringements and institutional gang affiliation. The purpose of the measurement was to determine to what extent the social demographic characteristic (school completion) influenced the individual behaviour of the inmates.

For current offence, the study found that 27.8% of the inmates in the sample had completed primary schooling (Grades 0–7), while 64.2% had completed any grade between Grades 8 to 11, and only 7.9% had completed their high school careers. The study found that there was a significant correlation ($\chi^2 (6, N = 151) = 12.611, p = .050$) between inmates’ school dropout and current offence. The study found that most inmates in this sample had not completed their school career, which is an indication that inmates started their deviant behaviour from a very early age.

For disciplinary infringements, the study found 69.1% of the inmates with Grade 8–11 had one or more infringements, followed by 61.9% for Grade 0–7, and 33.3% for Grade 12. The study found that there was a significant correlation ($\chi^2 (2, N = 151) = 9.620, p = .048$) between inmates’ educational status and their disciplinary infringements. Inmates responsible for most of the institutional infringements were those who were uneducated or had not completed their school career.

For street gang membership, previous convictions, substance abuse and institutional gang membership, the study found an equal distribution for school completion in these categories. The data shows that there was no significant difference between school completion and these variables.

In summary, when comparing school qualification as a socio-demographic indicator with individual-level factors, the data shows that current crime and disciplinary infringements were significantly correlation in respect an inmates’ school qualification. Street gang membership, previous convictions, substance abuse and institutional gang membership appeared to have no significant relationship to school inmates’ completion. From the data it may be concluded that inmates who are involved in crime and disciplinary infringements were mostly uneducated.
5.4. Explanatory model to predict institutional gang membership in a correctional centre

As discussed above, this study examined the relationship between individual-level characteristics defined through the Social Learning theory and inmates’ delinquent and deviant behaviour both prior to and post incarceration. The study also examined the effect of environmental conditions, defined through SSSL theory, on deviant and delinquent behaviour.

To develop a prediction model for institutional gang affiliation, the study used the Social Structure and Social Learning variables as a measuring tool to predict future and possible institutional gang membership. Future gang membership includes the individual level variables inmates had prior to incarceration to determine whether inmates were likely to become gang members. Indicators for possible gang membership include individual-level variables that apply both prior to and after incarceration to determine inmates’ gang status, if gang status is unknown. Using this model can determine whether an individual in fact belongs or does not belong to an institutional gang. For both predictions, the study considered the personal characteristics of the inmate and the social and cultural demographics of the centre.

In developing the prediction model, the study followed a three-dimensional approach, first measuring individual-level characteristics inmates developed prior to their incarceration that contributed to deviant behaviour. Second, it measured the Social Structure and Social Learning variables both prior to and after incarceration that exacerbated deviant behaviour. Lastly, it integrated the individual-level variables prior to incarceration with the SSSL in respect of significant relationships found between the above correlates. These factors combined produced a prediction model for institutional gang membership.

Using the logistical regression analysis methods of SPSS, this study first measured the personal characteristics (SLT dimensions) of inmates, and then the social and cultural dynamics (SS dimensions) of centres to determine which variables would positively predict institutional gang membership and misconduct. The SLT variables that could predict deviant and delinquent behaviour in a correctional centre included substance abuse, street gang affiliation, friends and family engagement in deviant
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behaviour, employment status, parental approval, current offences, perceptions, school career, age, previous convictions and length of sentence. The SSSL variables that were included for inmates’ social and structural characteristics and that could predict deviant and delinquent behaviour in a correctional centre include control, disciplinary hearing, number of assaults, age, employment, ethnicity and school career.

Table 5.19: Binary- Level Logistical Regression: Predicting Institutional Gangs: Individual Level Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables in the Equation</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Exp. (B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1a</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.897</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethnicity (1)</td>
<td>-.690</td>
<td>.603</td>
<td>1.311</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Substance Abuse (1)</td>
<td>1.644</td>
<td>.723</td>
<td>5.172</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Street gang affiliation (1)</td>
<td>1.977</td>
<td>.589</td>
<td>11.251</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment status (1)</td>
<td>-.885</td>
<td>.488</td>
<td>3.291</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marital status (1)</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.790</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School career (1)</td>
<td>-.334</td>
<td>.859</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geographical location (1)</td>
<td>.523</td>
<td>.437</td>
<td>1.431</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Previous convictions (1)</td>
<td>1.185</td>
<td>.430</td>
<td>7.605</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crime category (1)</td>
<td>.502</td>
<td>.463</td>
<td>1.174</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relationship with parents (1)</td>
<td>.360</td>
<td>.579</td>
<td>.386</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family arrested(1)</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>.995</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family Incarcerated(1)</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>1.074</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highest Grade passed</td>
<td>-.122</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>1.611</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.355</td>
<td>1.769</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.841</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: Age, Ethnicity, Substance abuse, Street gang affiliation, Employment, Marital Status, School career, Geographical area, Previous convictions, Crime category, Relationship with parents, Family arrested, Family incarcerated, and Highest grade passed.

Table 5.19 presents a binary-level logistic regression which was performed to ascertain the effects of age, ethnicity, substance abuse, street gang membership, employment, marital status, school career, geographical area, previous convictions, crime category, relationship with parents, family arrested, family incarcerated and highest grade passed on the likelihood that participants would join institutional gangs after incarceration.

The logistic regression model was statistically significant, ($\chi^2$ (14, N = 151) = 54.317, p= .001). The model explains 41.0% (Nagelkerke R2) of the variance in institutional
gang prediction and correctly classified 60.9% of cases. The study found that individuals who belonged to street gangs prior to their arrest were 7.02 times more likely to be members of an institution gang once incarcerated, followed by substance abuse with 5.2 times more likely to join an institutional gang and previous incarcerations with 3.3 times more likely to join an institutional gang once incarcerated.

Table 5-20: Binary Level Logistical Regression: Predicting Institutional Gangs: Social and Structural Dynamics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables in the Equation</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Exp. (B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse (1)</td>
<td>2.482</td>
<td>.994</td>
<td>6.230</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>11.965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street gang affiliation (1)</td>
<td>.491</td>
<td>.816</td>
<td>.363</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.547</td>
<td>1.634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status (1)</td>
<td>-1.238</td>
<td>.662</td>
<td>3.501</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status (1)</td>
<td>-1.128</td>
<td>1.075</td>
<td>1.102</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.294</td>
<td>.324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School career (1)</td>
<td>.963</td>
<td>1.137</td>
<td>.717</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.397</td>
<td>2.618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical location (1)</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>.571</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.679</td>
<td>1.266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous convictions (1)</td>
<td>.431</td>
<td>1.861</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.817</td>
<td>1.539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime category (1)</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.611</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.912</td>
<td>1.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with parents (1)</td>
<td>.688</td>
<td>.747</td>
<td>.848</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.357</td>
<td>1.989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary infringements(1)</td>
<td>-2.394</td>
<td>1.165</td>
<td>4.220</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family arrested(1)</td>
<td>-1.206</td>
<td>1.767</td>
<td>2.473</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age in groups(1)</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.749</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.976</td>
<td>1.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friends in street gangs(1)</td>
<td>3.484</td>
<td>.849</td>
<td>16.850</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>32.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family street gang(1)</td>
<td>1.541</td>
<td>1.260</td>
<td>1.495</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.221</td>
<td>4.669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at first offence</td>
<td>-.038</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.603</td>
<td>.963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of previous offences</td>
<td>.857</td>
<td>.513</td>
<td>2.790</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>2.356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive offences</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.628</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.826</td>
<td>1.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of disciplinary offences</td>
<td>.456</td>
<td>.719</td>
<td>.401</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.527</td>
<td>1.577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of gang progressiveness</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.537</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.994</td>
<td>1.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of gang supremacy</td>
<td>-.143</td>
<td>.622</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.818</td>
<td>.867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of institutional assault</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.377</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td>1.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of institutional control</td>
<td>-1.674</td>
<td>.498</td>
<td>11.281</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.576</td>
<td>2.716</td>
<td>.337</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.562</td>
<td>4.836</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variable(s) entered on step 2: Substance abuse, Street gang affiliation, Employment status, Marital status, School career, Geographical location, Previous convictions, Crime category, Relationship with parents, Disciplinary infringements, Family arrested, Age groups, friends in street gangs, Family street gang, Age of first offence, Number of previous offences, Aggressive previous offences, No of disciplinary offences, Aggressive disciplinary offences, Perception on gang progressiveness, Perception of gang supremacy, Perception of institutional assault, and Perception of institutional control.
Table 5.20 presents a binary-level logistic regression which was performed to ascertain the effects of substance abuse, street gang affiliation, employment status, marital status, school career, geographical location, previous convictions, crime category, relationship with parents, disciplinary infringements, family arrested, age groups, friends in street gangs, family street gang, age of first offence, number of previous offences, aggressive previous offences, number of disciplinary offences, aggressive disciplinary offences, perception of gang progressiveness, perception of gang supremacy, perception of institutional assault and perception of institutional control on the likelihood that participants would join institutional gangs after incarceration.

The logistic regression model was statistically significant, ($\chi^2 (23, N = 151) = 98.845, p= .001$). The model explained 65.0% (Nagelkerke R2) of the variance in institutional gang prediction and correctly classified 83.3% of cases. The study found that individuals who had friends who belonged to street gangs prior to their arrest were 32.6 times more likely to join institutional gangs after incarceration, followed by inmates who used substances at 12.0 times more likely, and disciplinary infringements at 0.1 times more likely to join institutional gangs after incarceration.

For perception of institutional control, inmates were of the opinion that institutional control positively reduced institutional gang affiliation.

### Table 5-21: Binary Level Logistical Regression: Predicting Institutional Gangs: Integration of SLT and SSSL Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables in the Equation</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Exp. (B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Substance abuse (1)</td>
<td>1.904</td>
<td>.847</td>
<td>5.054</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>6.711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street gang affiliation (1)</td>
<td>.456</td>
<td>.716</td>
<td>.405</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.524</td>
<td>1.577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary infringements(1)</td>
<td>-1.459</td>
<td>.729</td>
<td>3.998</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends in street gangs(1)</td>
<td>2.670</td>
<td>.646</td>
<td>17.072</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>14.438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family street gang(1)</td>
<td>1.471</td>
<td>1.136</td>
<td>1.678</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>4.355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of previous offences</td>
<td>.728</td>
<td>.322</td>
<td>5.114</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>2.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive offences</td>
<td>.315</td>
<td>.419</td>
<td>.566</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.452</td>
<td>1.370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of institutional control</td>
<td>-1.140</td>
<td>.380</td>
<td>9.016</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>1.541</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>.962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.964</td>
<td>1.834</td>
<td>1.146</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.284</td>
<td>7.127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.21 presents a binary-level logistic regression which was performed to ascertain the effects of substance abuse, street gang affiliation, disciplinary infringements, friends in street gangs, family in street gangs, number of previous offences, aggressive, aggressive offences, perception of institutional control, and age on the likelihood that participants would join institutional gangs after incarceration.

The logistic regression model was statistically significant, ($\chi^2 (10, N = 151) = 90.287$, $p= .001$). The model explained 61.0% (Nagelkerke R$^2$) of the variance in institutional gang prediction and correctly classified 80.8% of cases. The study found that individuals who had friends who belonged to street gangs prior to their arrest were 14.4 times more likely to join institutional gangs in correctional centres, followed by inmates who used substances at 6.7 times more likely, disciplinary infringements at 0.2 times more likely and previous convictions at 2.1 times more likely to join institutional gangs in correctional centres. For perception of institutional control, inmates were 0.3 times more likely to be of the opinion that institutional control positively reduces institutional gang affiliation.

Taken together, the data shows a significant relationship between street gang affiliation, substance abuse and previous convictions as SSSL variables prior to arrest, and friends in street gangs, substance abuse and disciplinary infringements as SSSL variables post-incarceration for institutional gang prediction. For SSSL variables prior to arrest, the study found that individuals who belonged to street gangs prior to their arrest were 7.02 times more likely to join institutional gangs once incarcerated, followed by substance abuse at 5.2 times more likely and previous incarcerations at 3.3 times more likely to join institutional gangs once incarcerated. For SSSL variables post incarceration, the study found that individuals who had friends that belonged to street gangs prior to their arrest were 32.6 times more likely to join institutional gangs after incarceration, followed by inmates who used substances at 12.0 times more likely and disciplinary infringements at 0.1 times more likely to join institutional gangs after incarceration. For perception of institutional
control, inmates were of the opinion that institutional control positively reduces institutional gang affiliation.

5.5. Conclusion

The personal characteristics and social background variables used in this sample were measured in relation to two factors, namely, social dynamics prior to and post incarceration. For prior to incarceration, the study found that there was a significant correlation between inmates' substance abuse and street gang affiliation, and between their family members and friends' membership of gangs and their own gang affiliation. The study also found that there was a significant correlation between inmates' substance abuse and parental approval of such usage. In the education sector, the study found that there was a significant difference between inmate dropouts and reasons for dropping out.

For post incarceration, the study found that there was a significant difference between inmates' institutional behaviour and their number of infringements, institutional gang affiliation and substance abuse rates. For inmate's perceptions and attitudes, the study found significant strong correlations between inmates' views on the progressiveness of gangs and the supremacy of institutional gangs, in both gang and non-gang members. Significant correlations were not found in respect of institutional assaults and control.

The impact on inmates of the social and cultural dynamics of the correctional centre showed that centres performed differently in dealing with inmates who violated the code of conduct. Centres that did not have sufficient control strategies in place to control inmate behaviour appeared to be socially disorganised. For social and demographic composition of the centres, the study found that there was a significant correlation between age categories and substance abuse, street gang affiliation, disciplinary infringements and institutional gangs. For ethnicity, the study found significant correlations between current crime and certain variables; employment (SES), street gang affiliation, disciplinary infringements and institutional gang membership; and also between current crimes, grade completed and number of disciplinary infringements. The next chapter provides a detailed discussion of the variables that were significant to this study.
The study managed to develop a gang prediction model, finding that individuals who had friends belonging to street gangs, who used substances and who had previous convictions were more likely to be gang members upon incarceration. If an inmate, while incarcerated, also engages in disciplinary infringements and holds negative perceptions of institutional control, it increases the probability of that individual’s institutional gang membership.

In developing the conceptual model for this study, the study explored the Social Structure and Social Learning theory to explain how individual behaviour is influenced by social learning factors. These concepts also demonstrated how social structure factors influence social learning factors to exacerbate deviant and delinquent behaviour. Lastly, the Social Structure and Social Learning theory enabled a prediction model based on an integration of the social learning dimension and the social structure dimension to predict institutional gang membership.
Chapter 6: Discussion of results

6.1. Introduction

In this study, the researcher has highlighted several empirical studies that increase understanding of violence and institutional misconduct within the correctional centre domain. Most previous studies focussed on historical variables (culture, structure and social dynamics) and dynamic variables (importation characteristics). The historical variables were used to postulate that institutional misconduct and violence had their roots in various realities, such as the deprivation inmates experience in correctional centres (Sykes 1958); the structural dynamics of centres including their physical design (Steinke 1991); and the rules, supervision levels (DiIulio 1991) and environmental stability of centres (Clemmer 1940; Wooldredge & Steiner 2009). The dynamic variables discussed in the literature, such as age and race, seemed to indicate that deviant and delinquent behaviour was imported into correctional centres. The researcher discovered that most prior studies identified the variables that cause deviant behaviour, but failed to explain how these variables caused deviant and delinquent behaviour. In addition, most studies were based in other countries; limited empirical evidence from South Africa existed to explain the phenomenon from a South African perspective.

6.2. Individual characteristics that enhance institutional gang affiliation

Inmates’ personal and social characteristics were measured for two different categories in the study. In the first instance, the study measured inmates’ personal and social environmental factors such as street gang affiliation, substance abuse, school dropout, criminal history and relationships with friends and family that contributed to their deviant behaviour prior to their incarceration. In the second instance, the study measured inmates’ personal and social characteristics, such as sentence length, disciplinary infringements, institutional gang membership, perceptions and current offences after incarceration that contributed to their deviant behaviour. The social learning dimensions of Akers (1998) were used to measure the extent to which inmates’ social and personal characteristics contributed to their deviant behaviour. The modes of association focussed on various associations inmates had and how these affected inmates’ behaviour. The matter of
reinforcement focussed on the operant conditions that individuals were exposed to that exacerbated their particular behaviour.

6.2.1. Social Dynamics: Prior to incarceration

Irwin and Cressey’s (1962:147) importation theory stated that individuals learned their deviant and delinquent behaviour from the street or community, which subsequently triggered their violence and misconduct in the correctional centre. In order to understand the way in which such street or community behaviour influences post-incarceration behaviour, it is necessary to know the type of behaviour, how it is learned, and why the individual engaged in such behaviour in the first place. In order to measure these categories, the study used street gang affiliation (DeLisi 2003; Drury & DeLisi 2010: 351) and substance abuse (Trulson, Caudill, Haerle & DeLisi 2012) as dependable variables to predict deviant and delinquent behaviour post incarceration. The study found that there were significant correlations between a number of variables for street gang membership and substance abuse that exacerbated deviant and delinquent behaviour, such as age, gang affiliation of friends, gang affiliation of family, previous convictions and school dropouts.

The study found a significant difference between inmates who had family members and friends in gangs and those who did not (Table 5.3). The study found that if inmates had family members or friends in street gangs, they were highly likely to be street gang members themselves (Jiang & Winfree 2006; Varano, Huebner, & Bynum, 2011). The study also found a significant correlation between age group of inmates and their street gang affiliation, in that younger individuals were more likely to belong to street gangs than older inmates (Cunningham & Sorensen 2007:252).

Regarding substance abuse, the study found a significant difference between inmates who had friends and family members who abused substances and those who did not have family and friends who used substances (Table 5.3). The study found that if inmates had family members or friends who used substances, they were likely to abuse substances themselves (Katz et al. (2011:56). Regarding age, the study found that younger individuals were most likely to abuse substances than older inmates. Winfree (2013) postulates that these inmates engage in such activities because of peer pressure. Individuals who had previous convictions also had a
significant relationship with substance abuse. Esbensen et al. (2001:128) postulate that the reason that substance abusers are so constantly in conflict with the law is that they cannot sustain their desire or need for certain substances and that they commit crimes to obtain such substances (Esbensen et al. 2001). Ellis and Walsh (2000:191) found that ‘parental use of illegal drugs is positively associated with illegal drug use by offspring, as well as other forms of criminality.’ Their findings were based on twelve personal interviews with individuals who used drugs and indicated that their parents used them too. Katz et al. (2011:56) concur with Ellis and Walsh’s notion, confirming a significant relationship between individuals’ substance abuse and family members’ substance abuse.

Other imported variables such as school dropout (Cao, Zhao & Van Dine 1997:112), current offence (Wooldredge, Griffin & Pratt 2001), employment, marital status and ethnicity were also tested. The data showed no statistically significant differences between these factors and the dependant variables. Regarding school dropouts, Cao et al. (1997:112) postulate that individuals who dropped out of school were more likely to engage in institutional misconduct in a correctional centre. However, this study found that dropping out of school did not contribute significantly to deviant behaviour or substance abuse. The study found an equal distribution of street gang membership and substance abuse amongst individuals across all levels of school completion. Empirical evidence indicated that age and previous convictions were significant indicators for substance abuse and street gang affiliation that inmates imported into the correctional centre. The non-existence of other South African studies made it difficult to conclude otherwise.

The data also indicated that street gang affiliation and substance abuse clearly contributed to deviant behaviour in the social environment prior to incarceration. In investigating whether this behaviour was transferred to the correctional centre, the study found that there was a statistically significant relationship between inmates’ street gang membership and their institutional gang membership. Inmates who belonged to street gangs were more likely to become involved in institutional gangs (Table 5.3). Research by DeLisi (2003; 2012) confirmed this relationship, indicating that prior involvement in street gangs posed a high risk to the centre. He further iterated that there is a strong relationship between institutional gang membership
and street gang membership (DeLisi, et al. 2012). For substance abuse, the study found consistent substance abuse in both scenarios. Inmates who abused substances prior to incarceration continued to abuse substances after their incarceration. Empirical studies on the relationship between individuals’ and family members or friends’ substance abuse were relatively few. The most recent study, conducted by Steiner et al. (2014: 462–470) found considerable evidence that inmates who are younger, who associated with antisocial peers, who used drugs before their incarceration or who had a prior record were more likely to engage in institutional misconduct.

Klein and Maxson (2006) when they reviewed the DARE (Drug Awareness Resistance and Education) programme in the US confirmed the concept of a relationship between inmates’ gang membership and friends and families’ gang membership. They discovered that there was a significant relationship between the variables of an individual and his family and peer’s variables that impacted on the likelihood of an individual joining a gang. In their study, they surveyed an extensive volume of literature on street gang affiliation to identify generalisable patterns for gang affiliation. Their findings were consistent with those of Pyrooz and Decker (2012), who studied a sample of 84 juvenile arrestees in Arizona for the external ‘push factors’ that compel gang affiliation. They found that inmates were mostly forced by external ‘push factors’ such as friends and family members to join gangs as a form of protection. Fleisher and Decker (2001:7), Decker (2007:184) and Griffin (2007:229) confirmed that there was a positive relationship between institutional gang membership and street gang membership. They found that individuals who belonged to street gangs were more likely to join institutional gangs, which are counterparts to their street gangs (Decker 2007; Fleisher & Decker 2001a; Griffin 2007). Morris, Carriaga, Diamond, Piquero, and Piquero (2012:199) postulate that inmates were resistant and disruptive because of attitudes developed prior to incarceration. Sorensen, Cunningham, Vigen and Woods (2011:148) found that assaults between inmates, and by inmates on officials, occur because of the violent behaviour inmates developed in their personal criminal histories. Institutional gang affiliation was associated with elevated rates of institutional violence even when
controlling for a number of measures associated with overall predisposition toward violence (Gaes, et al, 2002:383; Griffin & Hepburn 2006:447).

The findings and literature discussed supra provided an indication of the different indicators that contribute to deviant behaviour in a correctional centre, but did not explain how and where these individuals obtained such behaviours. This study measured the ‘how’ part of deviant behaviour. Akers (1997:64) stated that differential association comprises both behavioural interactions and a normative aspect. The findings regarding a correlation between an individual’s street gang affiliation and substance abuse and that of his family or friends (Winfree 2013:446) provide significant evidence of the interactional dimension; individuals who become substance abusers or street gang members do so because of their direct interaction with others who engage in similar behaviour (Steiner, Butler, Ellison 2014:462–470; Weerman 2011:278). Using Akers’ application of the interactional dimension that was tested in a public domain, this study found similar evidence for after incarceration; inmates who belonged to street gangs became members of institutional gangs, and inmates who did not belong to street gangs prior to incarceration ended up joining institutional gangs. Deviant and delinquent behaviour was frequently the result in individuals who associated with those who had adopted similar behaviour. The norms and values of these groups were deviant from that which is acceptable, which fills the normative dimension. The study established that deviant and delinquent behaviour was indeed learned prior to incarceration and was subsequently transferred to the correctional centre (DeLisi et.al. 2012). The interactional dimension was also related to the correctional domain because deviant behaviour was learned and reinforced in the correctional centre. Inmates who had not previously belonged to street gangs ended up joining institutional gangs, which supports the interactional concepts of Akers (1998).

Empirical validity on Social Learning theory from a correctional environment perspective was relatively limited; most studies were conducted in the public domain. This study has discussed the ‘what’ and the ‘how’ aspects of deviant behaviour. Regarding the ‘why’ aspect – why individuals engaged in deviant behaviour – the study found that that there was a significant difference between inmates’ substance abuse and their parental knowledge or approval thereof (Table 5.5). Data presented
in this study indicates that most inmates who abused substances said that their parents were not aware of their substance abuse. Regarding school career, most inmates dropped out of school during their primary and secondary school years (Table 5.6). Given the findings presented supra, this study can infer that such activities happened due to the absence of parental support and guidance. This notion was supported by several other authors (Mabuza & Roelofse 2013:54; Sumj et al. 2009:11–12) who found that most cases of early school leaving were due to negligence by the parents. Alleyne and Wood (2012:2) found that during the adolescent years, peer pressure plays a crucial role in an individual’s decisions and strong parental guidance at this time is imperative (Alleyne & Wood 2012:2).

The notion of lack of parental support and guidance was further examined in relation to the influence of friends on individuals’ deviant behaviour. Most inmates who abused substances and belonged to street gangs did so because of their friends. Kratcoski and Kratcoski, (1990:118) indicate that most juvenile offenders get caught in delinquent acts without the knowledge of the parents, and as a result of a lack of parental preventative measures, end up in correctional facilities. In such cases parents may reject the persons concerned because of shame and disappointment, which can be a traumatic experience and lead to several emotional problems such as aggression (Kratcoski and Kratcoski, 1990:118). Charkoudian et al. (2012) postulate that many inmates find it hard to communicate with their parents; for most of them, the relationship is already broken by the time they go to prison.

The differential reinforcement dimension of Akers (1998) postulates that criminal behaviour is learned through operant conditioning. Operant conditions refer to the balance of anticipated or actual rewards and punishments that follow or are consequences of behaviour (Akers 1998). The findings for substance abuse indicated a lack of parental guidance and supervision on inmate’s substance abuse and school leaving. The absence of parental guidance and advice implies, too, an absence of consequences or appropriate punishment from parents. At the same time, the individual may be observing the apparent rewards conferred upon friends who conduct deviant acts. In the correctional environment, inmates observe gang activities and institutional misconduct as favourable due to a lack of interventions by the administration to control these activities.
6.2.2. Institutional behaviour and adaptation

In the previous section, the study confirmed that inmates indeed learned their deviant behaviour in the community, and transferred it to the correctional centre. The study further confirmed that inmates learned their deviant behaviour through association with deviant friends and family members, because of a lack of reinforcement in definitions favourable and unfavourable to a particular behaviour. This study also discovered that deviant behaviour is not solely imported from the community, but can also be learned in the correctional centre.

This section focuses on how imported behaviour is related to and strengthened by conditions in correctional centres. To achieve the objective, the study used self-reported disciplinary infringements and institutional gang membership and compared these with the number of disciplinary hearings and assault investigations reported by the respective centres. The study also measured the perceptions of inmates on institutional life.

Previous studies on disciplinary infringements and gang membership focussed on the factors that contribute to inmates’ involvement in such activities. This study had a different approach; it measured the impact that the number of disciplinary infringements and institutional gang membership had on the individual. Differential social organisation refers to known causative aggregate-level characteristics of cultural, societal and geographical differences in crime rates (Akers 1998:332). The structural and the cultural characteristics of a particular community or society determine the level of crime (high or low) within such a community. In a correctional centre, the structural and cultural characteristics – in this case, disciplinary infringements and gang membership – were used to determine the level of deviant behaviour within a particular centre. Data presented in this study indicated that centres that failed to implement sufficient corrective measures (disciplinary hearings, assault investigations and gang profiling) had significant violations of the code of conduct. Such centres further allowed inmates who previously had not been gang members to adopt such deviant behaviours.

The failure of the management of correctional centres to institute sufficient corrective measures allows such centres to become socially disorganised. This notion is
support by Reisig (2002), who postulates that effective management, custodial culture, proactive staff interaction with inmates and programming opportunities results in less misconduct and violence than facilities that were poorly administered, managed and controlled. Inmates observe that other inmates who violate the code of conduct are not punished for their wrongful acts, and as a result other inmates follow suit. In this study, the high level of gang membership due to a lack of profiling resulted in a stronger gang presence at the centres and, due to the overwhelming presence of gang members, non-gang members were forced to join them or face manipulation and victimisation from gangs.

Given the circumstance, the obvious conclusion is that inmates became deviant due to a lack of operant conditions (balance of anticipated or actual rewards and punishments) also observed by Akers (1998) or due to a lack of effective control measures (Camp et al. 2003; Craig 2004; Dilulio 1991).

6.2.3. Inmates’ perceptions towards institutional dynamics

Previous sections of this study discussed modes of association and differential reinforcement comprehensively. The level of operant conditions observed by a particular individual will determine the extent to which that individual eventually engages in a particular behaviour. To understand the context in which inmates made their respective decisions to adopt a particular behaviour, we need to know how they perceive such behaviour (their perception).

In this study, inmates’ perceptions were measured based on operant conditions or definitions that were favourable or unfavourable to them and the correctional centre. Operant conditions refer to the balance of anticipated or actual rewards and punishments that follow or are consequences of behaviour (Akers 1998). Inmates’ perceptions were measured in two ways, first, by comparing the different perceptions across centres, and second, by comparing the differences in perception between gang members and non-gang members.

Data presented in this study indicates that there was a significant difference between the perceptions of inmates in the three centres on gang progressiveness and gang supremacy. Inmates from centres that had a strong and prevalent presence of institutional gang membership had a more positive perception of the progressiveness
of gangs and the power that these gangs had in the correctional centre. Amongst gang and non-gang inmates, the study found that there was a significant difference between the perceptions of gang and non-gang members on the issue of gang progressiveness and institutional control. Inmates who were gang members had a more positive perception of the progressiveness of gangs, whereas non-gang members had a more positive perception of authorities’ abilities to exercise control over centres.

Definitions refer to ‘orientations, rationalisations, definitions of the situation and other evaluative and moral attitudes that define the commission of an act as right or wrong, good or bad’ (Akers 1998: 65). Data on inmates’ perceptions show that inmates had a more favourable opinion of gang progressiveness and gang supremacy in centres where gang activities were prevalent. Based on their location and the validations of the social environment, inmates concluded that institutional gangs were favourable to them. Akers (1998) went further and stated that definitions serve as cues that make one more willing to commit an act, given anticipated reinforcement or punishment for the act (Akers 1998). Given the circumstances, the study can conclude that inmates had favourable definitions for gangs and gang activities due to a lack of anticipated punishment that might deter such a definition. Whether individuals were gang members prior to arrest or joined gangs only post incarceration was also determined by the definitions they attached to gangs and gang activities.

In respect of the personal and social characteristics of inmates, the study found that inmates indeed do import their deviant behaviour into correctional centres. The study also found that inmates not only learned deviant behaviour on the streets, but had it reinforced in the correctional centre. The study further found that inmates learned these behaviours through modes of association with other individuals who were deviant. Lastly, the study found that inmates learned their deviant behaviour due to a lack of parental guidance or support (the community perspective) and a lack of social controls in correctional centres.
6.3. Structural and cultural dynamics within the social system of the correctional centre that contribute towards gang activities and institutional misconduct and violence

To understand the complexity of the correctional environment it is important to understand the culture that is associated with correctional centres. The complexity of the physical environment stems from the dynamic of having one party which wants to enforce rules and regulations (the administration) and another party that does not want to be there (inmates). Theoretically, the social and cultural environment of the correctional environment is shaped by two elements, described in deprivation and situational contextual theories. In the deprivation theory, Clemmer (1940) described imprisonment as a transformation process that transforms individuals into fully-fledged criminals. During the transformation process, inmates are subjected to various depriving and humiliating conditions, also called ‘pains of imprisonment’, that have a severe impact on individual personal lives (Sykes 1958). The deprivation theory had two different views on the cultural and social dynamics of the correctional centre; first, there is the absolute deprivation that derives from overcrowding, strict visitation rules of inmates, compulsory correctional programmes and the enforcement of the code of conduct. Second, relative deprivation occurs by having to be in the centre and the sentence length. According to the situational contextual concept, Steinke (1991:129) postulates that control of the physical environment, staff characteristics and geographical characteristics of the centre have an impact on inmates’ deviant behaviours (Steinke 1991:129). In general, the two perspectives propose that inmate aggression is the product of stressful and oppressive conditions within the centre.

The purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which the deprivation and situational contextual concepts applied to an individual’s decision to become deviant once inside the centre. The study used the control of the physical environment or staff characteristics, overcrowding and geographical characteristics to measure the impact on individual deviant behaviour. To measure this impact, the study used Akers’ (1998) Social Structure and Social Learning (SSSL) theoretical concepts to determine how the social and cultural aspects of the correctional environment influenced inmates to become deviant. The main proposition of the Social Structure
and Social Learning (SSSL) theory is that variations in the social structure, culture, and locations of individuals and groups explain variations in crime rates, principally through the influence of these variables on individuals.

### 6.3.1. Institutional control

Institutional control for the purpose of this study refers to the control exercised over the physical environment by the administration (staff) of a correctional centre and overcrowding. A study conducted by Steiner (2014:469) postulates that when correctional staff and prison administrators begin to neglect various day-to-day security measures, allowing for the formation of inmate groups that may mobilise collective action, it can result in an escalation of misconduct. Overcrowding variables such as occupancy rate, ratio of guards to inmates, and institution size are also linked to the deprivation model as significant predictors that correlate with institutional misconduct (McCorkle, Miethe & Drass 1995).

Results in the literature on institutional behaviour and adaption are similar to those presented in this section, but the way in which the data was analysed is different. Initial analysis was based on individuals’ behaviour and how such behaviour was acquired. In this section, the focus is on how the social and cultural dynamics of the institution influenced individuals’ behaviour.

For overcrowding, the study found that there was no significant difference between the overcrowding levels of the three centres; all were severely overcrowded. The correlation between overcrowding and deviant behaviour has not been firmly established. Franklin et al. (2006) and later Wooldredge and Steiner (2009) state that there is no consistent evidence associating overcrowding with misconduct.

Regarding staff characteristics and the control of the centre, the study found that centres that failed to institute disciplinary actions or failed to investigate their assault cases had significant numbers of infringements and assaults at their centres. The study further found that centres that failed to profile inmates for gang membership, in order to develop a database of gang members, had more inmates who were gang members. The inability or negligence by the staff to be security cognisant at all times provided a sufficient platform for the formation of self-protective groups and eventually gangs, because inmates were forced to rely on fellow inmates for
protection. In addition, the inability of staff to deal effectively with the disciplinary infringements that transpired as a result of their negligent behaviour conveys a negative image of the centre to inmates. In combination, these factors cause inmates to continue misconduct to such an extent that eventually their lead is followed by all inmates (Steiner 2014:469). The lack of staff control also contributed to the perceptions of inmates, discussed previously, that institutional gangs had benefits and power in a correctional centre (see previous findings). Such perceptions are based on inmates' observations of daily life in the centres.

In circumstances where management’s control is negligent or piecemeal, inmates assume de facto control and the result is a state of social disorganisation. According to Akers (1998:330), social disorganisation refers to indicators such as inequality, social class, poverty, population instability or other factors that relate to a particular community’s crime rates. In this study and from a correctional perspective, social class and inequality appeared to be the most common aspects of social disorganisation in the correctional environment. Shaw and McKay (1942) postulate that social disorganisation refers to the inability of the community structure to realise the common values of its residents and maintain effective social controls (Kornhauser 1978:120)

From the data discussed supra, it is evident that correctional centres are not always socially disorganised, but it becomes the norm when centre administration (staff) fail to manage incidents of misconduct. Inmates exposed to a socially disorganised environment adopt the behaviour of those who confer on them the most benefits and protection; in this case, gangs.

6.3.2. Social and cultural characteristics of the correctional centres

In the previous section on the Social Structure concept, the study indicated that the level of institutional control exercised by staff over inmates could influence individual behaviour. Inmates can either conform or become deviant, depending on the circumstances. In this section, the study introduces a different perspective to attempt to understand the cultural and social dynamics of the correctional environment. Whereas previous studies emphasised how the social structures of the centres deprived inmates of their rights and thus contributed towards misconduct, this study
has largely focussed on the social and cultural characteristics of the inmate population. Now we turn to the social and cultural characteristics of the correctional centres.

According to Akers (1998:333), the differential location dimension of the Social Structure and Social Learning theory reflects on the social demographic or socio-economic correlates that socially define individuals in the larger community or society. This concept refers to various socio-cultural categories of individuals in a social structure that can contribute to criminal behaviour. These indicators include gender, race, marital status, age and religion. Since the study was based on the correctional environment, relevant indicators included, age, race/ethnicity, employment and school career.

Results presented on age, race and school career in this study are similar to those found in the literature on the importation perspective, but the way in which the data was analysed was different. Here analysis was based on the individual characteristics that inmates imported into the correctional centre, and used as demographic factors to determine their impact on the centre’s social and cultural environment.

Regarding age, the study found that age clearly contributed towards deviance in a correctional environment, for most of the categories of misconduct. The study found that there was a significant correlation between the age group of inmates and substance abuse, street gang affiliation, disciplinary infringements and institutional gang affiliation. For substance abuse, it was found that younger inmates were more likely to abuse substances than older inmates were. They also committed most of the disciplinary infringements and were the most prominent figures in institutional gangs. No significant correlations were found between age and current crime or previous convictions.

Empirical validity on age in the socio demographics of Akers’ SSSL theoretical model from a correctional environment perspective was not available since this is the first study where this model was tested. However, Lee et al. (2004:29) found similar findings when testing adolescent alcohol and marijuana use in Boys’ Town residents, examining the roles of gender, age and class as differential locations in all four social
learning theoretical dimensions. They found that there was a positive relationship between all three indicators of the differential social locations and the four social learning dimensions. Their finding is consistent with that of this study, which is that juveniles and young adult inmates appeared to be more prominent in the abuse of substances and affiliation to gangs (street and institutional) and tended to commit more disciplinary infringements than older adults. Younger inmates appeared to be more delinquent and deviant but as they grew older this type of behaviour become less frequent.

For race or ethnicity, Nurco et al. (1986:115) examined urban male narcotic addicts’ criminal involvement in terms of their ethnicity. They found that there was a significant correlation between ethnicity and the amount and types of crimes committed. The study revealed that crime rates might differ in neighbourhoods, depending on the dominant ethnic group residing there. Findings presented by Nurco and others may be relevant in correctional centres with a diversity in inmate populations.

In this study, it was found that coloured inmates committed more violent crimes than Black inmates did, and that black inmates, on the other hand, committed more sexual offences than Coloureds. For substance abuse, street gang affiliation, disciplinary infringements, previous convictions and institutional gang affiliation, the study found that there was no significant correlation with race. The study found that that these variables were mostly equally distributed amongst the ethnic groups used in this sample. The findings of Steiner and Wooldredge (2014; 2015) differed from those of this study. They found that black inmates were more likely than white inmates to engage in rule-breaking from an individual-level perspective. The study was conducted in Ohio and Kentucky correctional centres across a sample of 2 388 Blacks and 3 118 Whites.

Lee (1998) argued that anomie and social disorganisation theories propose an inverse relationship between socio-economic status and criminal behaviour. Individuals’ in the middle and upper class (employed individuals) tend to be associated with different patterns of association and reinforcement, than lower class (unemployed individuals). The attributes of lower class individuals were predictors of high criminal involvement (Cloward & Ohlin 1960; Shaw & McKay 1969). Although
this refers more to a community perspective, the same groups are found in correctional centres. The correctional centre will test whether inmates from the so-called upper class (in this case defined as those who were employed and had reached higher levels of formal schooling) committed fewer acts of institutional misconduct than those from the so-called lower class.

Regarding employment status, the study found that it was a predictor of deviant and delinquent behaviour in a correctional centre. There was a significant correlation between employment status of the inmate and their street gang affiliation, number of disciplinary infringements and institutional gang affiliation. No significant correlations were found between employment status of inmates and current crime or previous convictions. Inmates employed prior to their arrest appeared to be less likely to be involved in street gang affiliation, disciplinary infringements and institutional gang affiliation than inmates who were unemployed prior to their arrest.

Regarding education, the study found that there was a significant correlation between inmates’ educational status and their current crime and number of disciplinary infringements. Inmates who had completed their school careers were less likely to engage in disciplinary infringements than those who had dropped out of school. No significant correlations were found between educational status and street gang affiliation, institutional gang affiliation, substance abuse and previous convictions. Inmates in these categories were evenly distributed across the inmates’ scholastics achievements.

In respect of the structural and cultural dynamics within the social system of the correctional centre that enhanced gang activities and institutional misconduct, the study can confirm that the social and cultural characteristics of the centre, and its levels on institutional control, significantly contributed to delinquent and deviant behaviour. For institutional control, the study found that inmates’ deviant behaviour was indeed influenced by the social controls that are exercised by the administration. Inmates had their deviant behaviour strengthened and reinforced by the social and cultural environment of the correctional centres. Regarding the Differential Social Location dimension of the Social Structure and Social Learning theory, the study found that the social demographic indicators (age, education, employment status and ethnicity) positively contributed towards delinquency and deviant behaviour in a
correctional centre. Younger and unemployed inmates tended to be more deviant than those who were older and employed prior to their arrest. Inmates who were involved in institutional misconduct were mostly young; as they grow older, the phenomenon becomes less frequent. Coloured inmates committed more violent crimes than black inmates, whereas black inmates had more sexual crimes than Coloureds.

6.4. Explanatory prediction model for institutional gang membership in a correctional centre

Findings presented in Chapter 5 provide empirical evidence that various personal and social characteristics of inmates developed both prior to and after incarceration contributed towards delinquent behaviour in correctional centres. Empirical evidence has also been presented indicating that the social and cultural dynamics of the correctional centre have an effect on the personal characteristics of the individual, whether deviant or conforming.

To expand on the findings, the study embarked on developing a prediction model to assist the Department of Correctional Services to predict possible gang membership in correctional centres. In developing the model, specific emphasis was placed on variables that had significant values in this study. The study used three different binomial regression models; the first focussed on inmates’ individual-level variables, and second focussed on the correctional centres’ social, cultural and demographic aspects and the third focussed on an integration of both these models to ensure the effectiveness of the final model. The prediction model indicated that substance abuse, previous convictions, friends in street gangs, number of disciplinary infringements and inmates’ perceptions of institutional control significantly contributed to predicting institutional gang membership.

In its White Paper on Correctional Services (2005:79), the Department of Correctional Services acknowledged that institutional gangs had a pervasive control over the social environment of correctional centres, which posed a serious risk to inmates and officials. To address the problem, the Department of Correctional Services implemented an anti-gang strategy, which required the establishment of a structure (i.e. a database) at all levels to identify, collect and analyse data on gang membership, gang activities and gang associations to manage risks associated with
violence and disruptive behaviour (Department of Correctional Services: Anti-gang Strategy 2009:7). During the data collection process, this study found no implementation of the objectives of the anti-gang strategy mentioned supra. The study could also not detect any evidence of a framework or guideline to assist officials in implementing the objectives of the strategy.

The Department of Correctional Services’ Anti-gang Strategy (2009) intended to implement five broad objectives:

- To maintain a secure and safe environment that is conducive to the rehabilitation of inmates and the attendance of remand detainees in court processes and external movements;
- To facilitate the management approach to prevent and reduce the impact of disruptive groups (i.e. gangs) on the management of correctional centres;
- To enable inter-sectorial co-operation (i.e. government and civil society) to promote correctional centre and community safety;
- To address the potential negative effects of incarceration;
- To develop knowledge about gangs and effective responses for gang management, and to review, monitor and improve such knowledge and responses.

This study is of particular relevance to the second objective of the Department’s Anti-gang strategy, i.e., to prevent and reduce the impact of disruptive groups (e.g. gangs) on correctional centres. In implementing the strategy, the Department included three objectives that this study may go some way to fulfilling:

- To capacitate and support staff and managers to recognise and understand different forms of violence, coercion, abuse and threats;
- To establish a structure (i.e. database) at all levels to identify, collect and analyse data on gang membership, gang activities and gang associations to manage risks associated with violence and disruptive behaviour; and
- To support existing structures, including intergovernmental agencies, with strategies to deal with organised crime (including gangs) towards an integrated approach.
Using the prediction model developed in this study, the Department of Correctional Services will be able to identify possible institutional gang membership and even identify future gang members during their admission. Regarding the second objective listed above, this study will assist the Department with identifying gang members, establishing a gang database and identifying associated risks. The prediction model identifies five risk areas that contribute to gang affiliation, namely; substance abuse, previous convictions, friends in street gangs, number of disciplinary infringements and an individual’s perception of institutional control.

For substance abuse, the study found that inmates learned such deviant behaviour in their communities, which they later transferred to the correctional centre. Inmates who abuse substance are also more likely to offend repeatedly, because of the need to sustain their addictions and their inability to financially sustain their habits. Data presented in this study indicates that 95.7% of the inmates in this sample abused substances. To address the substance addiction phenomenon, the Department of Correctional Services currently presents correctional programmes to assist inmates with overcoming their addictions. These programmes are insufficient to deal with the substance abuse of inmates because the rate remains high. Since substance abuse was identified as a predictor for institutional gang membership, there is a need for a more aggressive approach, such as clinical rehabilitation.

Regarding previous convictions, the Department of Correctional Services’ Minimum Security Standard Policy (2006:46) requires the early identification and management of vulnerable inmates; i.e., first offenders and inmates whose lives are threatened by gangs. The prediction model establishes that inmates who have previous convictions are more likely to be gang members. Using the model to identify individual gang members will assist the Department to identify vulnerable inmates and separate them from hardened criminals. The model will also assist the Department of Correctional Services to identify high-risk inmates and accommodate them separately in specific correctional centres, as required by the Minimum Security Standard Policy (2006:47).

Regarding friends in street gangs, the Correctional Services Act (Act 111 of 1998:40) makes it mandatory for correctional centres to conduct a comprehensive assessment of inmates in respect of their security risk classifications. The purpose of this
classification is to determine the risk levels that individual inmates pose. The existing assessment tool (G 303) does not make provision for examining inmates’ social associations and relationships. By incorporating this indicator into their assessment, the Department of Correctional Services would be able to predict future gang membership more accurately.

The three prediction indicators discussed above can be used to predict gang membership upon admission, since this information is available upon admission. Regarding disciplinary infringements as an indicator, the goal should always be to respond promptly, effectively and comprehensively to incidents and threats to the safety and security of inmates and staff in the centre (Department of Correctional Services: Anti-gang Strategy, 2009:4). According to the strategy, correctional centres must ensure enforcement of the disciplinary code and applicable criminal processes for inmates and maintain proper records. In this study, disciplinary infringements were identified as a positive predictor for gang membership. Data presented in this study indicates that irrespective of the high number of self-reported disciplinary infringements by inmates, centres were still failing to institute corrective measures against those inmates who failed to comply with the code of conduct.

Regarding the perception of institutional control, the study found that inmates’ perceptions of a centre’s social controls influence his decision to conform or to become deviant. Centres identified as socially disorganised in this study had a significantly high prevalence of gang activities and disciplinary infringements, due to the failure by staff to institute corrective measures against inmates who violated the code of conduct. As a result, inmates who previously were not engaged in gang activities eventually joined gangs, partly in order to protect themselves.

6.5. Conclusion

This study was conducted partly to determine why individuals engage in institutional gang membership and misconduct. Empirical findings made in the study provide new insight into the environmental conditions of correctional centres in South Africa. Previous studies indicated what type of behaviour inmates’ import to correctional centres, but failed to explain how and why these behaviours came into existence and how they related to specific infringements in correctional centres. This study, using
Social Learning theory, dealt with the ‘how’ and ‘why’ part of the phenomenon. The study discovered that deviant behaviour was not only imported to correctional centres, but was clearly reinforced and in many cases exacerbated there. The lack of sufficient controls and supervision to change erroneous definitions and reinforce correct ones were found to be the biggest contributors towards delinquent behaviour, both in the centres and in the social environments from which inmates came.

Insights were also presented in respect of the social structures of correctional centres. Previous studies mostly dealt with the social and cultural dynamics of the correctional centre independently, whilst this study, using the SSSL theoretical model, integrated the individual and institutional aspects to provide a more comprehensive understanding of institutional disciplinary problems. The study found that the social and cultural dynamics of centres had a fundamental influence on individual personal characteristics, and in many cases contributed to deviant behaviour.

Findings presented in this study also led to the development of a prediction model, which can assist the Department of Correctional Services to proactively identify institutional gang members and further to identify existing institutional gang members in the centre. Important to mention is also that this is the first empirical study conducted within the borders of South Africa that provides a perspective that is unique to South Africa.
Chapter 7: Conclusion and Recommendations

7.1. Introduction

The goal of this study was to understand and explain the way in which institutional gangs control the social and cultural environments of correctional centres and contribute to levels of misconduct and violence. The primary objectives in fulfilling this goal was to determine the variables that lead to institutional gang membership and to determine the specific ways in which the social and cultural environment exacerbates gang and misconduct activities in the selected correctional centres. The theoretical approach of this study was based on Akers’ (1998) Social Structure and Social Learning theory, which focuses particularly on individual behaviour from a micro and macro perspective.

7.2. Conclusion

This study was substantial for several reasons. It confirmed the findings of prior studies with respect to personal and social characteristics that inmates import into correctional centres, and it expanded the existing literature with respect to how and why inmates import their deviant behaviour into correctional centres. It further brought a new element to the field of criminology by identifying the demographic characteristics of the inmate population that contribute towards institutional gang membership and violence. The study also expanded upon prior findings regarding risk factors associated with institutional gang membership by developing a prediction model to predict possible gang membership prior to and after incarceration. Finally, this is the first known empirical study to examine the social and cultural contexts of correctional centres in South Africa.

Regarding personal and social characteristics, the study found that inmates import their deviant behaviour from the streets to correctional centres. In respect of how and why they import such deviant behaviour, the study demonstrated that inmates’ deviant behaviour developed through modes of association with other individuals who were deviant. Inmates learned their deviant behaviour because most of their friends and family members were deviant and the constant exposure to such behaviour became the norm or standard of life for the individual. In addition, operant
conditions played a significant role in inmates’ deviant behaviour; they observed rewards, rather than punishments, following deviant behaviour. Deviant individuals presented in this study preferred friends as role models rather than parental guidance and support. Most who abused substances had street gang affiliations and friends with similar attitudes.

The learning of individuals’ deviant behaviours mostly occurred during their adolescence and had a fundamental impact on their lives. The main source of deviant behaviours was peers. Their interactions and associations with deviant peers contributed to their early school leaving and substance abuse. Individuals who abuse substances are in constant need of their substances, and to sustain their addictions, they use extreme measures such as stealing; for this, gangs provide the support they need. Individuals who get involved in gangs invariably end up in conflict with the law and in correctional centres. Once exposed to the correctional environment and under the influence of hardened criminals, their criminal life styles expand. Over 50% of inmates interviewed were members of street gangs and most indicated that their friends were, too. The literature (Thornberry 2003) suggests that gang members are more likely than non-gang members to be arrested, and most of them are juvenile inmates (Esbensen et al. 2002).

Reasons uncovered for deviant behaviour were friends’ examples and lack of parental guidance and support. Of the inmates in this sample who abused substances, 70.9% of them indicated that their parents were not even aware of their off-springs’ addictions. According to Thornberry’s (2003) selection model, individuals who belonged to gangs did so because of an existing propensity to commit crime. Even though parental guidance is important during adolescent life, each individual still has a choice either to accept the norms and values of society, or to become deviant.

It becomes apparent, when viewing the data, that the influence of deviant friends on an individual’s’ behaviour is a major contributor to the social problem South Africa currently faces with gangs. Although street gangs constitute small groups in relation to communities, the sample presented in this study (Table 5.1) indicates that, statistically- speaking, more than every second inmate belonged to a gang. It is a clear indicator that most street gang members become criminals and end up in
correctional centres. In addition to the influence of peers to join gangs, substance addiction pose a serious risk to society because the data presented in this study (Table 5.2) shows that almost all inmates abused substances. This demonstrates the link between substance addictions and crime. Those who abused substances became repeat offenders because of the need to sustain their addictions.

In conclusion, the study can confirmed that high-risk individuals in society are those who are in their adolescent stage, who abuse substances, and who have friends in gangs. Most such people end up being street gang members and eventually criminals and repeat offenders.

The assumption might exist that all inmates behave similarly because all of them have committed criminal offences and are housed together in a correctional centre as a result. However, because of differences in their personal backgrounds, inmates still respond differently to the environmental conditions of the centres. Findings presented in this study show that inmates who had street gang membership continued such membership after incarceration. The reason may be related to Thornberry’s (2003) selection perspective whereby inmates become institutional gang members because of central elements within themselves, such as substance abuse and a propensity for crime. The link between street gangs and institutional gangs seems unbreakable; an individual’s needs, desires, and habits remain the same, whether the person is incarcerated or not.

The study also demonstrated that individuals could learn deviant behaviour in the correctional centre. Inmates who had not previously belonged to gangs ended up joining gangs after incarceration. The study found that the level of institutional control exercised by the administration over the social environment had a significant impact on whether inmates conformed or became deviant in the correctional centre. Socially disorganised centres had a stronger prevalence of deviant activities, such as gang membership and disciplinary infringements. The persuasive manner in which gangs operated in the correctional centres exposed non-gang members to extreme manipulation and victimisation to such an extent that they are forced to join gangs out of fear of being victimised; self-protection becomes the main reason for gang membership in correctional centres.
A second influence on inmates’ behaviour in correctional centres was also brought to the fore in this study. The study found that the demographic, social and cultural characteristics of the inmate population partially determined how inmates behaved in the centres. The social demographic indicators of age, education, employment status and ethnicity were significant indicators for delinquency. Younger and unemployed inmates tended to be more deviant than those who were older and employed prior to their arrest. Inmates who were involved in institutional misconduct were mostly younger inmates; as they grow older, the phenomenon becomes less frequent. Coloured inmates committed more violent crimes than black inmates did, whereas black inmates committed more crimes that are sexual.

This study also developed a prediction model to predict possible gang membership prior to and after incarceration. The risk factors associated with the prediction model are substance abuse, previous convictions, friends in street gangs, disciplinary infringements and the individual’s perception of institutional control.

7.3. Recommendations

The application and the practicality of the prediction model identified in this study are of utmost importance and the basis for many of this study’s recommendations. If implemented, these recommendations can assist the Department of Correctional Services to deal with institutional gang membership, based on two flow diagrams:

The first flow diagram illustrates how existing policies and procedures can assist in the application of the prediction variables (deviant friends’ association with gangs, substance abuse, previous convictions, age, and disciplinary infringements). The second flow diagram demonstrates the expansion and integration of the model to assist the Department of Correctional Services and other law enforcement agencies (e.g. the South African Police Service, the Department of Social Development and various intelligence agencies) to develop an integrated gang database for gang members.
Substantial correlations were provided in this study showing that an inmate’s relationship with deviant friends, street gang affiliation and previous convictions significantly contributed to his deviant behaviour.

The dominant role that peers and associates play in the lives of individual inmates needs to be taken more seriously. During admission to a correctional centre, inmates are subjected to various forms of assessment. In the comprehensive risk assessment (form G303A), which focusses on past crime and criminality, limited attention is paid to the influences of peers during the current or past crimes. The purpose of this assessment is to develop an appropriate plan to address the criminal behaviour of the inmate. Excluding the new admission’s relationships is a flaw and leaves gaps that lead to incorrect assessments. The recommendation is that the assessment process upon admission includes the role of friends in the inmate’s criminal history. This data can be obtained during the security risk assessment that is done during the admission phase and can be verified with the SAP 62 (crime description) and SAP 69 (previous conviction) forms that indicate the number of accomplices involved in a particular crime.
Second, the issue of substance abuse and treating addictions needs to be looked at more closely. As has been established, substance abuse is a common and indeed dominant factor amongst inmates in South African correctional centres. Substances are obviously not easily available in correctional centres and the inability of inmates to sustain their habits forces them to use alternative means (rule violations and gang membership) to obtain what they need. Currently, institutional policies only make use of orientation and therapeutic programmes to assist inmates in dealing with their addictions. These are ineffective because they do not address the problem on the physiological level. Inmates continue to use substances. The study recommends that addicted inmates be subjected to a more aggressive clinical and psychotherapeutic treatment process, which includes medical treatment and support programmes to address their substance addiction. Providing such support will actually stop the addiction at a more fundamental level. It is likely to have a spill-over effect in that inmates will no longer need gang membership for drug acquisition.

The socio-demographic factors identified in this study can also assist the Department of Correctional Services with proper profiling of inmates. The study found that inmates’ behaviours differed in respect of their educational background, their employment history, their age and their ethnicity. Institutional policy on the security risk classification (form G303H) currently makes provision for only the age of inmates. Including the other indicators will assist the Department of Correctional Services to classify inmates more accurately and thereby eliminate unnecessary victimisation and manipulation of vulnerable inmates.

The anti-gang management strategy supposedly already in place requires the enforcement of a code of conduct and applicable criminal processes for inmates and the maintenance of proper records (Department of Correctional Services: Anti-gang strategy 2009:4). Data presented in this study indicates that there is a close relationship between gang activities and institutional misconduct. The failure to institute disciplinary proceedings against inmates who transgress the code of conduct results in a socially disorganised correctional centre, which is a breeding ground for institutional gangs. The study therefore recommends that the Department of Correctional Services put more emphasis on the discipline of inmates as a control measure for the social environment.
The first flow chart illustrates the profiling and assessment of inmates to predict gang membership in a correctional centre. To manage the gang phenomenon effectively, it is important to have a database to indicate who the gang members are in a correctional centre. The second flow chart demonstrates an expansion and integration of the model at various management levels within the Department of Correctional Services and other law enforcement agencies.

**Figure 7-2: Flow Charts on a National Integrated Gang Management Plan**

In South Africa, institutional gangs are a very prominent phenomenon that poses a serious risk to the day-to-day operations of correctional centres. They have national networks and are responsible for most violent activities that occur in correctional centres across the country. The fact that the numbers gangs have a national network requires the profiling of inmates at all correctional centres across South Africa, and therefore the study proposes that the prediction model be implemented nationally. According to the anti-gang strategy of the Department of Correctional Services, the
Department must develop an intelligence and information management system that provides a database at all levels on gang membership, gang activities and gang associations (Department of Correctional Services: Anti-gang strategy 2009:7).

Once individual assessment or profiling has been completed and inmates are positively identified as gang members, the relevant correctional centre must then generate electronic profiles for each individual in the system. The individual must be added to a gang database than can profile each centre, management area, region, and the Department in respect of gangs in correctional centres.

The Department of Correctional Services can then share the database with SAPS (the South African Police Service) to fight crime by allowing SAPS to add to the individual profiles, making each one more comprehensive.

Implementing these recommendations will ensure compliance with the anti-gang strategy of the Department of Correctional Services, which indicates that each centre must have a database for all inmates belonging to gangs (Department of Correctional Services: Anti-gang strategy 2009:8). It can also assist the Department by separating vulnerable inmates from gang members, thus preventing victimisation and manipulation.

7.4. Theoretical implications

Empirical findings in this study have generated some new insights into the correctional environment in the criminology field. Although previous literature on the Social Structure and Social Learning theoretical perspectives focussed on the public domain, this study successfully integrated it into the correctional centre environment. The empirical evidence presented according to the Social Structure and Social Learning (SSSL) theory generally supports the conceptual foundations of the importation and deprivation theoretical concepts. The researcher expanded on the existing theoretical concepts by explaining why and how inmates became deviant in both a social and correctional environment. Previous literature only names the indicators that can contribute to institutional misconduct and violence.

To illustrate the application of the theoretical model in the correctional environment, the study used three flow charts. The presentation proceeded in three stages; first
the individual-level characteristics that are linked to the social learning dimension were shown, second, the social and cultural dynamics of the centre that are linked to the social structure dimension were shown, and third, the integration was shown of the two perspectives that form the Social Structure and Social Learning theoretical model.

Figure 7-3: Theoretical Model on Individual-Level Characteristics That Predict Deviant Behaviour within the Social Learning Context

For the social learning dimension, the study found that deviant behaviour – street gang membership – is learned through association with deviant friends who have street gang membership and who abuse substances. The lack of reinforcement, parental supervision, and operant conditions also positively contributed towards individual deviant behaviour.

In the correctional centre, the study demonstrated that institutional misconduct and gang membership resulted also from modalities of association, the lack of reinforcement (disciplinary hearings) and operant conditions (institutional perceptions). Individuals who did not have street gang membership, deviant friends, or disciplinary hearings, and who had a positive perception of institutional control measures at the centre, tended to conform to institutional requirements, whereas the opposite is true; inmates to whom the above factors applied tended to be deviant.
Regarding the social structure dimension, the study used differential social association and differential social location to describe causes of deviant behaviour in the social and cultural dynamics of the correctional centre.

Figure 7-4: Theoretical Model on the Social and Cultural Dynamics of the Correctional Environment that Predict Deviant Behaviour within the Social Structure Context

SOCIAL STRUCTURE THEORY

CONducive Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SS</th>
<th>Differential Organisation</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>Differential Organisation</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>Differential Location</th>
<th>OLD</th>
<th>Differential Location</th>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disciplinary Hearing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Assault Investigations</td>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YOUNG</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HOSTILE Environment

Previous studies indicated the type of structural and cultural components that contribute towards deviant behaviour, but did not empirically indicate how these components combined to contribute towards inmates’ deviant behaviour. Using the Differential Social Organisation concept, this study illustrated that the centre can become socially disorganised due to a lack of institutional control by the correctional administration. Correctional centres that impose disciplinary hearings and conduct proper investigations into their assaults tend to have a more conducive environment, whereas centres, which neglect these aspects, become disorganised and hostile environments.

The Differential Social Location aspect also enables a new perspective on inmate deviant behaviour in correctional centres by illustrating how socio-demographic factors such as age and employment status contribute towards inmates’ deviant behaviour. Centre populations that are relatively young and comprise mostly unemployed individuals are more likely to be deviant (making up a hostile
environment) than those who are older and who were employed prior to arrest (making up a more harmonious and conducive environment).

The integration of the two flow charts presented above illustrates the application of the Social Structure and Social learning theory holistically. The development of the individual-level behaviour of inmates both prior to and during incarceration that contribute towards deviant behaviour, and the impact that social and cultural dynamics have on individual-level behaviour, is illustrated with the integration model of the theory.

Figure 7-5: Integrated Theoretical Model Illustrating Individual and Structural Dynamics That Contribute To Conforming or Deviant Behaviour in the SSSL Context

Centres with a high prevalence of individuals who are classified as deviant within the social learning context (Figure 7.3), and which are classified as hostile within the social structure context (Figure 7.4), will be socially disorganised and have a strong prevalence of gang activities and institutional misconduct. Conversely, centres that have inmates classified as conforming and which have conducive environments will be socially organised, with a minimal presence of gang activities and misconduct.
The study further illustrated that deviant behaviour is not only a product of the street, but can be learned and certainly reinforced in correctional centres. Inmates who are classified as conforming in the social learning context and who are exposed to hostile environments will, to a great extent, become deviant.

Finally, it is important to note that the study was significant in two ways:

- First, it presented a different perspective for understanding how and why inmates develop deviant behaviour in correctional centres.
- Second, it produced the first South African perspective on the social and cultural environment of correctional centres.

7.5. Limitations

There are several limitations to this study that should be acknowledged:

First, the non-existence of a gang database at certain centres forced the researcher to rely on self-reported gang affiliation by inmates. The sample population was also limited to two institutional gangs whereas there are six different numbers gangs in South African correctional centres. The validity of the study was however not compromised because most numbers gangs have similar operations and inmates’ gang affiliations could be confirmed through observation of tattoo markings, and the researcher’s long experience in the field.

Second, missing documents such as statistical information on disciplinary hearings, gang profiling and assaults was of great concern, because it created inconsistency in respect of the data. The complete statistical data was not available at all centres. St Albans had missing information on the number of disciplinary hearings conducted and incomplete records on assault investigations were found at Cradock Correctional Centre. To ensure consistency, the researcher resorted to confining the data to the previous six months (July to December 2016), which was available in all centres.

Third, the signing of the informed consent form by juvenile inmates was problematic. To ensure that ethical validity was maintained, the researcher obtained permission from the centre management to allow the Unit Managers of the particular sections to act as guardians of the inmates who fell within the jurisdiction or mandate of the Department of Correctional Services.
Fourth, South Africa is a very diverse country that accommodates several ethnic groups, but due to the limitation of this study, only those ethnic groups present in the three correctional centres in the Eastern Cape Province of South Africa were included. The sample population included only three ethnic groups, of which the majority were black, followed by Coloureds, and only one Caucasian. To ensure consistency in the application of the study, the researcher did not consider the one Caucasian for the purpose of analysis. The removal of the one case did not have a severe impact on the results of the study.

Fifth, the persuasive manner in which institutional gangs control the social environment of the correctional centre was of great concern. The study found that institutional gangs were responsible for most deviant acts but the study could not link the deviant acts to a specific gang. There are currently six different numbers gangs that operate in correctional centres nationally, and this study was limited to only two. The numbers gangs are very secretive and more in-depth intervention is required. To make an effective analysis of the phenomenon, a longitudinal study would have better impact.

7.6. Future directions

The results of the current study assist in identifying various avenues for future research:

To obtain a better understanding of the gang phenomenon, it is recommended that a longitudinal approach be followed. This approach would allow researchers to conduct personal interviews with both inmates and correctional officials over an extended period, which would provide results that are more accurate. It is also recommended that the study be conducted across regions to ensure that all six numbers gangs are incorporated in respect of their operations, such as initiation rituals, membership numbers and roles.

The empirical validity of information sourced from the social and cultural environment of correctional centres in South Africa is very limited and therefore further studies are encouraged to bring new insight into the phenomenon of gangs in correctional centres. The prediction model postulated here is based on only three correctional centres and one study. Additional research is needed to refine and develop the
model to make it even more accurate at predicting gang membership and institutional misconduct.

In terms of the theory, the SSSL theory contributed significantly to understanding the social environment of the correctional centre and therefore more in-depth research on this theoretical concept is encouraged.

### 7.7. Conclusion

Institutional gang activities and misconduct largely depend on the setting and its responses. An in-depth knowledge of inmates’ personal background and social backgrounds is fundamental if one strives to maintain control over a correctional centre and foster an atmosphere conducive to rehabilitation. The end result of a period of incarceration largely depends on the setting to which the inmate is exposed daily, particularly given the lengthy periods which many inmates remain in the correctional setting. The theoretical and empirically based findings in this study, and the prediction model developed, provide an important basis for understanding the social and cultural dynamics of the South African correctional environment. Continued research into the complex relationship between of the social and cultural environment of a correctional centre and the individual inmate is imperative for further development in the field of criminology.
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